Committee (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) in pursuance of their Seventh Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) pertaining to Demands for Grants (2005-2006) of the Ministry of Urban Development.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Status of implementation of recommendations contained in the eighty-third report of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Transport, Tourism and Culture

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI PRAFUL PATEL): Sir, I lay on the Table a Statement regarding 'Status of implementation of recommendations contained in the Eighty-third Report of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Transport, Tourism and Culture.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Deputy chairman, sir, I have to submit, in advance, that I have a deficiency today, I am somewhat debilitated. I have got fever and a very bad throat, But, because I have said that I will initiate the discussion, I did not wish to be discourteous to the House and I shall endeavour with my speech, maybe, at fault. But, I beg the indulgence of the House in that regard.

We have had some earlier discussions on matters impinging on foreign policy. For example, on the IAEA vote and Iran, or, the nuclear matter and as far as the USA is concerned. But the discussions on those incidents were not really discussion on foreign policy as such. Therefore, I would make a distinction between the two.

At the very beginning, I wish to submit to the House that there is quite thin attendance. So, let us be assured that discussions on external affairs are not just one-day matches. And, we don't see this as an opportunity to grant or deny certificates of patriotism either to somebody of the Government or another. But I will make an observation here, Sir, I have watched, over the years, that the ruling party has a tendency to indulge in what I call unreal iconography.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

They also have a very hagiographical interpretation of our history, particularly since 1947. And, there is a completely unbelievable tendency to project as if the Foreign Policy of the country too is "dynastic." You can have your own arrangements in the party as 'dynastic.' But, to make a suggestion that the Foreign Policy of the country is also 'dynastic' is really to stretch our credibility. On this account, the Government fails to recognize change, and it begins to impose yesterday's *mantra* on today's reality. That, I think, is the classical difficulty that the management of the country's Foreign Policy, today faces, which is, you have to make a choice, and a realistic choice, between idealism and realism. And, this is the fundamental dichotomy. Beyond this, I do not wish to elaborate; for even by themselves, these are significant aspects of the management of our Foreign Policy. And, one could spend a great deal of time, analysing these. But beyond the conceptuals, there is, yet another, I think, crippling deficiency that this Government has. And, that is the 'street opposition' to their policy by their own allies. I know, Sir, that the Left Parties have a tradition that is based on their ideology; and, they have been enunciating it for a very long time. But, I am left completely at sea and I try and interpret the attitude to Foreign Policy, for example, of the RJD. And, I find that other than quite spectacular flamboyance in utterances. There is really very little interest in the Foreign Policy. You cannot have a Government, which projects the country's Foreign Policy, and is yet so divided about it from its principal allies, who are in support, of the Government. That becomes a critical and a crippling deficiency. It is impossible for me to project how much of a mockery then that makes of the country's management of its international relations. We too wish to observe this, and I do submit to the Government, on this account, that thereafter, for the Government, to continue to project the UPA's CMP. And, there is neither the UPA in the management of the Foreign Policy, nor is any CMP. And, if internally, or domestically, that be the reality, then, please try and conceptualise what it does to the conviction that we carry in the international arena. Very briefly, Sir, I must, having said that, share that what, I think, ought to be India's international agenda, our concerns interests and priorities must be based on vital national interests.

Sir, we need to have a much clearer understanding of the nature of national power. I will come to it in a minute. Indeed, also either with the powerful neighbours or powerful nations, we need to be very clear about the concept of strategic partnership. ...*(Interruptions)*... The word of strategic

partnership that is now, currently, in fashion, has to be based for good relations on a congruence of interest, there has to be the basis of settled borders and no conflict on trade. That is the reality and that really must be the basis on which we assess. Thereafter, how we try, reform the situation and improve it, is a different matter. Sir, I know that I will anger a great many by saying this that India's power, internationally — we like to say it, but I have difficulty in convincing myself about that — is not based on moral. We like to have this illusion about ourselves, and have had it for several decades, soon after independence. But, then, we suffered very badly on that account. I do not want to go into an analysis of that period. That is why I say, Sir, that the first security is a country's economic security. If the country is economically stable, it self-sustaining and it can stand upon its own feet, then, it will stand up against any territorial, conceputual or ideological assault.

Militarily, Sir, I have said it often and I repeat that India has to say that all nations on the earth have an equal and legitimate right to security. It is the nations that will determine what their interests are and they must decide it. We must not depend on others because dependence on others is not the sound basis on which a country like India can continue to move forward.

There are two very important aspects of the management of our external relations, and those, Sir, are internal order and externally sound fences. I do not know if we have either of these two. We would be deluding ourselves if we thought that internally the country has a stable order; it has not. And do we have sound fences on our borders? It is one of my everlasting regrets, Sir, that now 58 years after independence, India is, perhaps, the only country, of its size in the world, that still has unsettled borders. It is a crippling deficiency and it does shackle India internally. It is in this light, I say, we can keep deluding ourselves if we do not recognise how central and how important this is.

Sir, the principal intiatives of this Government, lately, have been three or four. ...*(Interruptions)*... My focus, Sir, firstly is on initiatives with the United States of America, them, the initiatives on nuclear issues and, thirdly, on Non-Proliferation matters, and vote in the IAEA. Though we have had debates on this, and I will not revisit the ground that has already been covered, but let me revisit these very briefly. The Prime Minister mentioned, and, quite rightly, that the United States of America being the pre-eminent global power, he sees it is an overwhelming factor in an international relations

currently, and what is the enourmous power that the United States has? It is powers of economics, it is military, it is technological, and, very sadly, it is also cultural. Now the relevance of good relations with the United States has to be measured against this anvil. Though I would have difficulty in recommending the cultural also, but that is there. From coca cola, to films, that is a factor that invades our cultural space and has been doing it for the past several years. But alongwith that, the United States of America wields this power sometimes with finesse, more often, rather hamfistedly. It is, presently, asserting the hegemony that it has and is rather enjoying that hegemony. We would be in error if we thought that the United States of America is a reluctant hegemon, it is not. But it suffers from two illusions which no other country in the world can set right or correct the United States of America, but India. And they argue that even the United States, surely, must know and recognise that political hegemony is seldom partnered by intellectual hegemony. There is another aspect that I must share with the House. The United States must also recognise that the dominant control or position about information does not equal the possessing of wisdom also. This is the kind of very rough template that I draw; and, therefore, when we consier Indo-US relations, what is the ultimate challenge that we as India face? We in India have always known through centuries that the essence of power is to know the limits of own power. I am afraid, the United States does not have that understanding and that it is only India that can candidly put it across to. There is another illusion that we have. That because we have gone into areas like strategic partnership etc., we must, therefore, never disagree, that would be a grave error. We must candidly, squarely, disagree where there is a need to disagree, but there is no need for India to be disagreeable every time that it disagrees, not with the United States, not with any country, for that matter. So, the principal challenge that the United States faces and, again, it is only India that can help the United States face it, is how to help the United States, transform its near unique position, unique in the annals of human history. No other empire, for it is an empire now, has had such untranmmelled power as the United States has, we must know this. I want to elaborate this point that this U.S. power is effective only if it is converted into a global, moral consensus. Otherwise, it will fail. That is the reality. Today's powerful will become tomorrow's powerless. That history has taught us more than any other country in the world. And, that is why, I say what I do. Sir. Now, it is in this overall context that there is a need of recognising the pre-eminence of the United States of America, but also of not belittling the eminence of India or the relevance that India has in international affairs.

The concerns that, I think, and, if I might share them with the Government, are that we have to be very clear. We have to be very clear, and we have to be clinically analytical in analysing, assessing as to where the current US policy is headed. Where is it headed? Where is the United States going? In which direction? Is it clear to the United States as to where they are headed? Is it clear to us where they are headed? Have we ever sat with them and said, 'look, let us analyse where you are going'. I have often mentioned to the United States of America the differences that separate — and that is how I have interpreted — India's approach to diplomacy and the approach that the United States has. India approaches relations moving from the general to the specific, we have to first have a general basis of understanding only then the other, to find an equation or the groundwork, on that foundation on which we can move forward. It is the reverse with the United States of America. They have, what I have often told them, — you have a checklist to diplomacy system. You start the morning at 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock or at whatever clock you start, and you have a little notebook in which you write your five-seven points, and at the end of the day, if those five-seven points are not scored out, then you wouldn't have had a good day. It is very difficult for India to work like that. That is why I say that we must be very clear in assessing what is the US policy, and where are they headed. I can only go, Sir, by what they themselves have said on September, 20th 2002 in a speech. that I won't read there. It was President Bush's first term, and he made it in an academic institute then. There were five or seven benchmarks that he laid down. They were, Sir, pre-emption, and, clearly, the United States secondly mentioned about the use of weapons of mass destruction against terrorists and against terrorist-States; thirdly, the President of the Unites States of America clearly stated there that the US is somewhat impatient of international bodies, particularly, of the United Nations and, therefore, they are not happy. They don't consider themselves as bound by that. There is, in the precincts of the United Nations, a very old joke that in fact, for the United States of America, there are no P-5.

There is another assumption, and that is, if I may put it so, a kind of pulpit evangelism about democracy. Now, democracy is all very fine, Sir. But, I have occasion once to mention that the total electorate in India, at about 671 million, is almost, not exactly, but almost, larger than the combined populations of the United States of America and the whole of West Europe. You could well say that India does not have perfect elections; perhaps not. I mean no disrespect to our former Chief Election Commissioner, who currently adorns our benches. I have been, since the

fourth General Elections, participating in this greate adventure and so, when some comments were made to me, I had occasion to share with my friends that we may have other deficiencies, but actually we do count a little better than Florida did. Nevertheless, according to me, this should not be treated as some kind of a battle. We have no need to be defensive about it. And I am not ready to accept the arrogation of democratic evangelism by the United States of America; certainly not. I don't wish to analyse this in great detail. I don't have to go in my analysis even beyond our immediate neighbourbood or the Gulf. Let us accept that just as with us, or with any other country, the United States places its own national interest as of prime importance. I don't hold it against them. That is how it should be. That is how countries will do.

Sir, there is a layering of human rights thrown in by the United States to make this a complete dish. It is like a dressing on a salad. But then, on that dressing, is a rather sharp sauce, and that sauce is what they call the 'US right to intervene'. Now, you earlier had a pronouncement of policy, which was prevention, pre-emption, regime change. These were extremely dangerous. We have witnessed examples of it and certainly, intervention in that direction is not something that India is comfortable with or ought to be.

Sir, in the Gulf, now there is neither a map nor prospects of peace. This is an extremely volatile situation. I do not wish to assign blame but I cannot help pointing out that this extremely tinderbox kind of situation, which is in our neighbourhood, is the contribution or the failures or misconceptions of the policy of the pre-eminent global power today.

Sir, because for several years, I was engaged with the representatives of the United States of America, I told them on several occasions that you are 8,500 miles away and we are not even eight and a half minutes away. So, what you do affects us much more immediately, much more directly than you will ever be affected. Sir, these are the concerns that I think I must first voice. Before I go further on analysing the position of the United States of America, let me share parts of a very fine, I think, a very succinctly put comment on the Indo-US relations in the context of what President Bush's visit has done on 2nd of March. This is by Henry Kissinger. Some of the hon. Members might have read it. The *International Herald Tribune* has carried it. In a part of it, Kissinger says, "If this emerging partnership is to flourish, each side needs to understand what has brought them together." That is quintessentially the realist school of foreign policy.

That is why, I have started with the two schools, the idealistic and the realistic. I think, it is axiomatic that if we are moving together down the path of a strategic partnership, then we must understand why has the United States done it and why have we done it. I don't want to revisit the whole debate. I had deliberately not participated init, Sir. It is a good thing. We must continue to have good relations with the United States of America.

Sir, in the second part, he writes, Americans think of their country as "the shining city on the hill"; its political institutions are perceived to be both unique and relevant to the rest of the world as guarantors of universal peace. Crusades on behalf of democracy have been implicit in American political thinking and explicit in American policy periodically since Woodrow Wilson - and especially pronounced in the George W. Bush administration." He goes further to say, "That is not the way Indians view their international role". and, he had a transformation. I am sure, hon'ble Mr. Natwar Singh, as a very experienced practitioner of diplomacy, knows what I am talking of. But, Kissinger observed that this is not the way Indians view that international role. "The Hindu society does indeed also consider itself unique, but, in a manner, dramatically at variance from America's. Democracy is not conceived as an expression of Indian culture, rather, as a practical adaptation, the most effective means to reconcile the polyglot components of the state that is emerging from a colonial past". I think he puts it rather well and puts it succinctly. It is long itself. Now Sir, he goes further, but I won't go into the other quotations. Sir, it is in this light, that I would like to share a few thoughts about what we agreed on the 2nd of March. There are just two aspects that I have been trying to find an answer to. What is in it, 2nd March understanding? It is not an agreement between President Bush and Prime Minister Mr. Manmohan Singh. What is in it for India and why did the United States do it? What is in it for the United States of America? I think, that distills what is an 'nuclear deal'. Dr. Manmohan singh has candidly and repeatedly, I think, in both Houses, said that his quest is motivated by energy security. With that, he considers, and quite rightly, that energy is the foundation of economic security and economic is the first security. I do believe that, Sir. I do not dispute that at all. And, I myself, am a subscriber to that. I do also believe that good relations with the United States of America are necessary for the economic development of India. Good relations as between two sovereign countries. So, what have we got? I won't pointlessly dwell into the entire numbers, figures, all the rest of it. As Members of this House, as representatives of

various political parties and thinkers, this is an aspect that we need to ask ourselves, find the answer ourselves. The next question also, we need to think about and find an answer. Why did the United States of America do it? What is in it for the United States of America? Now, I have been trying, Sir, to understand, because I have dealt with this subject, I don't call myself an expert, but, I have travelled on this road a bit, and I find that in the United States, currently the Bush administration is seized of the foreign policy immobility. I will cite just two or three reasons in which I think are the possible reasons. And, they wanted a success, because Iraq is not a success. With Aerial Sharon and the condition in which he is, Hamas ascendant in Palestine, and Hizboolah in Lebanon, there is no 'roadmap to peace.' That is in tatters. Iraq is a great tragedy. And now, the uncertainty is about Iran. Where in this spectrum would President Bush be just before the elections start in May of this year? When Governance really comes to a standstill there, where would he be? About India,' let's get this thing'. And that is why, I read some snippets or news items that the President, as he debouched from his aeroplane says 'I must have this deal' to certain official, etc. Presidents do tend to do this. Therefore, there is nothing wrong with that. But we have to be very clear in our mind, did we also absolutely want this deal? I am still not very, Sir. My approach is not coloured by any prejudice in this regard. The United States wanted India finally into the yard. India was outside. Prime Minister himself said that we needed to move into the sunlight of legitimacy. That is a very fair observation. Because India had to stop being part of the problem, and it had to be a solution. But was that the best way or the best manner to do it? I leave that there, Sir.That is why, I would recommend that as a follow-up to what has happened or has been done, the logical thing, which is in consonance with the India stand otherwise, India must now consistently work towards lowering the currency and the symbolism of Weapons of Mass Destruction. It is very important that at a certain conceptual level this is what India should do. If I enter into an analysis of the numbers of 'operationally deployed warheads'... What are the numbers of 'operationally deployed warheads' *per se* that Russia and the United States of America have? They vary between 1800 and 2700. It is a staggering figure of operationally deployed.

In that context, therefore, when we go into a very complex discussion of sufficieny-I won't go in to all those details-it is very important that we address this. I do wish to submit to the Government and to the House that it is my experience that the world of non-proliferation and disarmament is actually exemplified by dishonesty and by double standards. That is the

reality of the global nuclear order and has been from the early beginning. I won't cite countries. Therefore, what had happended was that India was relatively, relatively not entirely, outside of the shadow of this dishonesty. By what we have done, by arriving at a partnership with the pre-eminent power, we have begun to knock on the doors of sharing privilege, and that also willingly. But I wish to caution all of us that that would colour India as willingly wanting to be partners in double standards. This is very heavy price to pay. All our idioms and all the arguments pre-98, in fact, no longer apply. This is the second affirmation that I think we need to make.

Also, I would like to quote just a little bit on Iran issue, and that is about neighbourhood. It is almost a cliché phrase by now that Iran is the home of an ancient civilistion. That is self-evident. I have often cited that till 1947 our borders met at Zahedan. Recently, when I went to Baluchistan, I called it momentous because I was able to travel on the Gwadar Highway. But I wanted to go up to Zahedan. The last outpost is the Customs post. We have foregotten these connections. For the last several decades, Iran got caught in two pincers. One is of near perpetual Islamic revolution Turmoil and the resultant mis-governance and, thereafter, equally crippling, unnatural external interest and interference in Iran's affairs which is principally born of an insatiable western greed for control over Iran's hydrocarbon resources. Sir, Iran in a very strange fashion, from the very beginning-I don't want to go into the history of it-as a courtry, demonstrates perhaps more than any other country, more possibly than our immediate neighbour which is Pakistan-but I don't want implications to be attached to that-the multiple failures of the management of the US foreign policy in Iran. An when I say, US, we should read the rest of the west also. And for each failure of the United States in this region, Sir, the region has paid, but, in a very real sense, India has paid. And we will continue to pay. I wanted to conceputalise many times but was completely at sea. Sir, to denigrate Iran, you built up Saddam. It is a fact, Then, you sent Saddam and Iraq spiraling down into a vortex of disorder and chaos, a near civil was and a possible splintering apart of that country which in any case was a country born, indeed, in 1914-20 efforts. And that is why, Sir, we now witness everyday the killings that we do. Well before 1991, the United States, the IAEA and all these and all the evidence that they wanted for the multiple violations of so many of the P-5, plus, of course, Pakistan and the Khan Research Laboratory of A.Q. Khan was the pre-eminent power, was the United States of America, was it not virtually a silent bystander or was it a participant? It is a question, we must ask ourselves. Now, sir, in

this situation, because it you violate the NPT, therefore, action, as in Iran's case, will follow. Is the United States of America in violation of the NPT by doing what it is doing with India? This is not an impertinent question, Sir. It is a question that we should ask ourselves. Is it a violation of the NPT or any other international agreement is relevant only if a country other than the United States of America is involved? It is very difficult for me to accept or to recommend that India also pursue this path. That is the hesitation I have, Sir. I know there is no answer to it. But it is a caveat, it is a caution and it is a hesitation, I believe, with the Government. I know, sir, the time that I have is little but, just a few words about our immediate neghbourhood and then a few words about our larger neighbourhood. We must persist with peace. The Government has made efforts about peace, though it is worrisome that with not one single neighbour does India have settled relations now. I don't want to go into an analysis. And, as I said, it is the only country of its size that still has unsettled border, international border.

This is a crippling deficiency. This shackles our feet, India's feet in the management of our international relations, reduces the flexibility that we have. We spackle our feet, as, far as the flexibility in our approach to the United States of America is concerned. Sir, we must agree on that thought, because I had come to that painful experience, and abandoned that approach altogether. Sir, we must abandon totally pursuing the subject of India-Pakistan generates, it originates or it perpetrates; please stop raising this subject with the United States of America altogether. And I had said this in these many words to Collin Power-from me, you will never hear anything about Pakistan, and also, to the rather impressive, very impressively physiqued official-cum-politician,-and with him also, I have shared the same sentiments-I say it, Sir, as an aspect of India's self-confidence, India's pride, and even with the United States of America, an assertion of, how should I put it, sir,-let it even be, in rajasthani or what my colleague said in Punjabi-India's *akhkhadpan*. Sir, we are *akhkhad*, but we should not have any difficulty in being *akkhad* when the need arises. Here, we propound a great deal of non-violence, and all that. But let us also see that in the guise of non violence, Sir, निर्वीर्य भी न हो जाए। Sir, that is one point. I do think that perhaps, the Government ought to share with us the details; these are not the details. The outline, the sketch, what is the pursuit or what is the principle or what is being pursued in the talks that they are having with Pakistan and, what I now see, with which I often have difficulties, but I have not vioced it earlier, the kind of freedom, autonomy that is being given to parts of Jammu & Kashmir, or travel, it worries us. What you have agreed to, people would like to know. Bangladesh has a situation.

And Sir, Bangladesh requires a discussion by itself as does it, indeed, with Nepal, and I have my worries, sir, that the Maoist elements and the leadership are invited by the Government of India in the vicinity of Delhi to hold talks here. There is a message in that; it is not a very reassuring message.

Sir, as far as the larger neighbourhood is concerned, there is an are of instability that lies ground India. I recollect, Sir, that when I had the job that I had in South Block, I had once mentioned in the House that a scimitar of instability encircles India. The hon. Prime Minister, then the Leader of the Opposition took objection to my use of the phrase 'a scimitar', suggesting that there is symbolism in it, which I must desist from. That is why, I have said 'an arc of instability'. But it is , Mr. Chairman, Sir, a 'scimitar', whether it is Pakistan or Afghanistan, Iran or Iraq, Central Asia, indeed even the caucasus South Caucasus. Fatah is on the decline, and Hamas on the ascendant, and Hezubullah is dominant in Lebanon, where it opposed Rafik Hariri's assassination. These are some of the very wide aspect, Sir, And I am worried because, we have physical presence of foreign tropps. What is NATO doing in Afghanistan? What has NATO got to do with Afghanistan? But, they are there. India cannot go to Afghanistan, I cannot go across Pakistan. Sir, I was told that amongst the distribution that they have arranged between themselves, by themselves, I mean the Western powers, the British have got the development of the districts, the law and order, for example, is with the US, the police is being trained by the Germans. I do not know whether it is an apt choice, and them, the legal system-I am sure the hon. Minister for Law would be very impressed-is being introduced in Afghanistan by the Italians. I am astonished at this choice. I do not know why and how we are sitting silently. Sir, I could elaborate their deal on this. Sir, the impact of these forces, who are currently in the region, what they do, or fail to do, will impact directly on India's National interests more than any other country in the region, and that is why, I cite all this as a great challenger, posed to our statecraft, as also to our foreign policy.

With China, I just wish to add two, three sentences, which is that, over the years, and it is my experience, and I greatly enjoyed and benefited, engaging myself on various issues with them. So the People's Republic of China has grasped the essence of national power, perhaps, much better than that we have. I do not cite this as an Indian debility. It is part of the characteristic of the civilization, which is India, and we need to refer to it, to take it on board, and there is another aspect that I wish to also put here:

which is that the nature of power, national power, is such that it must continue to expand, and it must continue to become more and more powerful, like the United States of America. Otherwise, that power will go, and therefore, those countries, which are today powerful, will continue to expand their power. That has to be accepted as a reality of international affairs. If that works on the basis of the Realist School-I still wish to be idealistic that situation improves-I share President Putin's observations. Sometime back, he shared this thought with the rest of the world, 'that the break-up of the USSR has been a diplomatic and strategic disaster', not just for Russia, but globally. This has unsettled the entire region. An into that, into the vacuum that has been left behind, it is the extra regional forces that are now rushing in. We have to analyse this very carefully against the litmus paper of our national interest. But, we also need to take not, Sir, that very lately, Russia has now moved in the direction of, of course, an internal re-ordering, and therefore, axoimatically, an external reordering too. We need to watch this, which leads to my concluding thought, and this is the thought that I have been reflecting up on, for sometime now. Sir, India lies at the tri-juction of three collapsed empires-the Ottoman, which collapsed in the early decades of the 20th century; the British, which came during the end or towards the middle, and the Soviet Union which collapsed towards the end of the 20th century. Each collapsing or collapsed empire, leaves in its wake a sort of disorder, where the collapsed imperial power itself attempts, always, to usurp, to regain, to re-conquer and put back whatever interests it had. The Ottoman Empire and its collapse, left with us the political geography of the whole of, what we call West Asia, or the Middle East. Sir, as a very young officer, Archibard Wavell, served the Field Marshal, Edmund Allenby. Now, Wavell later himself became the Second last icerory, and thereafter, a Field Marshal himself. He has written a wonderful biography of Allenby, called "A Study in Greatness," and there, commenting on the main international agreements and treaties that have brought the first great war to a close, Wavell wrote, after the 'war to end all wars', they seem to have been pretty successful in Paris at making a peace to end all peace. It is a very good book on the subject, Sir. This is what that collapsing empire did. The collapsing and collapsed empire of the British, vivisected our land, divided our people, and psychologically wounded the whole of South Asia, what centuries of other occupations had not done. What the third collapse, that of the Soviet empire, has done is that great crucible of mankind, that hinterland or rather the heartland of Islam-the Central Asian Islamic countries-is hostile. These are realities, Sir, because all that is our larger neighbourhood, and

1.00 PM

that is, India is the only country that will bear the brunt of it in totality because, we lie at the tri-junction of these three collapsed empires. That is reality, and it is certain that is the challenge that the management of our international relations and foreign policy confront. I have taken some little extra time. I am very grateful to you, Sir. I am also very grateful to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister that they listened to me with so much patience. Thank you.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

PROF. P.J. KURIAN (Kerala): Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. Sir, I think, I always have the opportunity to speak after the Leader of the Opposition, M.r Jaswant singh. He concluded his speech by mentioning about the decline of three big empires. I want to the Leader of the Opposition to hear me. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition should also listen to me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As has been agreed to in the morning, there will be no lunch break, and we will continue with our discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs.

PROF. P. J. KURIAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition concluded his speech by mentioning about the decline of three big empires and also cautioning us to be very careful. I was thinking then like this. All these years India stood on its own strength. The Indian civilisation survived for the last 5,000 years. In spite of all invasions, in spite of the decline of all other empires, in spite of British occupancy and British rule, India survived. Therefore, I would simply say, let us not be pessimistic; let us be optimistic. There is nothing to be worried about. Nothing has happened to worry so much. That is what I want to say.

Sir, I was listening to his speech very carefully, He is talking. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You carry on. ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Now, I will look at you. I Always look at the Opposition. That is the whole problem.

Sir, he was making a microscopic analysis. What will happen, when you do a microscopic analysis? You will see even the minute things. You will probe and find out the minute things and they will be magnified 10,000 times. So, minor and insignificant things are exposed here as magnified. That is what he has done. I like, especially, his style of English. I have a

lot of respect for him. I always listen to his speeches carefully. I like his style of English, the way he speaks and even the jugglery of words. I think, it would have been better, had he made the first part of his speech in the US Senate because the speech was full of homiles to the United States. He has mentioned, what is the problem of US hegemony; what is going to happen to them, etc. For half of the time he spoke about the United States. I was wondering why he was so much cocnerned about the United States. Perhaps he wanted to present a picture as if we are agreeing to all that the United States are doing. Where did he get this perception from? I am not an expert on foreign affairs. I am an ordinary man. As an ordinary man, I have never spoken on External Affairs. I have never asked as to who are going to speak. Simply because we have signed an agreement with the United States, which we think is in our best interest, how can anyone say that we are agreeing to all that the United States are doing? You have every right to differ. The Left differs. I respect them. They have a right to differ. You can also differ. There is no problem. But what I am asking is this. Simply because we have signed an agreement with the United States, how can you presume that we are condoning or that we are agreeing with all that the United States are doing? That is a misrepresentation of facts. I have to confess it. I have the best example with me. I have read the newspapers, not for the sake of foreign affairs but just out of interest. I have not seen any head or leader of any country who has got the guts and courage to tel the United States on their face that Iraq occupation or invasion, whatever you call it, is wrong. We condemned it on the American soil. I have seen that and I have read it. Not that alone, in this very House—I was not a Member of this House at that time—a Resolution was passed and I know that we, from our side and from the side of the Left, wanted to use more strong words to condemn the United States. Tell me, who has brought the softened words to condemn the United States? Who brought them? I was not here in this House. I read in the newspapers the words to condemn the Iraq invasion, high quality invasion. There was a dispute — I read in the newspapers—on which word to be used. The softened word was brought by whom! Everybody knows. I need not say that. So, to tell us that we are ignoring the national interest and nobnobbing with the USA and agreeing to what they are doing, to say the least, is untrue. It is misrepresentation of facts. That is my first submission.

Sir, when the NDA Government was in power, there was a charge that the NDA was tilting towards the West and the USA. There was a charge

that the non-alignment policy was being diluted by the NDA. Of course, my Left friends may complain; they may have a perception that even today it is being diluted. I will come to that later. But, everybody knows that. The general complaint was that the NDA was diluting the non-alignment policy. We have, from day one, as a political party and as a Government never deviated or diluted the principle of non-alignment. Why I say political party and Government because ours is a democracy; sometimes, different views will come and for that matter. I would like to tell the Leader of the Opposition that if some of the coalition partners have a different view on certain issues, it should be seen as a part of freedom of expressing the opinion and, at the same time, retaining the Government. In a democracy, this is perfectly allowable, this is perfectly correct. Even within one party, there will be different views. Likewise, in the UPA, there may be different views, but you should be concerned about the outcome only.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I take only a minute. I am not going to refute any point. I just need the consent of my good friend, Prof. P.J. Kurian. I have an appointment with the doctor. I have already apologised to the Prime Minster also.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: You need not say that. You are a great man. Sir, I have really appreciated your speech . I am only expressing my views.

When the NDA was in power ....(*Interruptions*)..... Sir, he is prompting me to attack the Left. I will come to that later. When the NDA was in power, there was an allegation that the NDA was tilting towards the USA. But when the Congress Party was in power, all through, form day one, both the Governemnt and the Congress Party, never deviated from or diluted the non-alignment principle and we stood with Palestine. Our party and our Governemnt always stood with Palestine? Can the BJP say, as a political party, whether they stood with Palestine? I have read statements of the BJP leaders in newspapers wherein they have criticised our policy towards Palestine, Therefore, please don't say that the UPA Government has shown any tilt towards the USA or the UPA Government have surrendered our national interest.

Sir, the basic questions being discussed here are mainly two. One is our policy on Iran. The second is our nuclear agreement with the USA. Both these have been discussed here at great length. So, I would say only one or two things about them.

In reply to the debate on the nuclear agreement issue, the hon. Prime Minister's statement states very clearly that it is in our national interest.

Shri Jaswant Singh, the Leader of the Opposition, himself said that the first security was the economic security. Let me quote the Leader of the Opposition. He says, "The first security is the economic security. Therefore, Government's effort to ensure economic security should be applauded. It should not be criticised. If we are not secure as regards energy, where is the economic security? And everybody knows this. Yes, we have coal reserves; the only problem is that it will pollute the environment. Therefore, we need nuclear energy. There was a time when some people thought nuclear energy could not be used inlarge measures. But the fact is that France is having 70 per cent of its energy from nuclear sources. Sir, nuclear energy is clean energy. Sir, Dr. Kasturirangan is not here. He will vouchsafe me for what I am saying. It is in our interest and, in the context of our energy security, that we should get fuels for our neclear reactors. We were isolated. Therefore, it was in our national interest that agreement was signed.Thee is nothing more than that. That is what I am saying. That does not mean that we justify all what American is doing—the so-called hegemony or whatever it may be. That does not mean that we agree to that or we support that. This point has been explained unequivocally by the hon. Prime Minister. So, I need not say it again. Therefore, this allegation is not correct.

Then, I come to the enlightened national interest', an expression that has been pooh-poohed by both, the Leader of the Opposition and my good friends in the Left. I was thinking what this enlightened national interest was.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): They have to be enlightened. ...(*Interruptions*). Yechury Saheb has to be enlightened.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURI (West Bengal): Our surprise is that it is coming from darkness. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: I have certain doubts. First of all, let me say what I think about non-alignment. I will come to the enlightned national interest later. Everybody wants that we should follow the policy of non-alignment.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Non-enlightenment!

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: I will come to non-enlightenment. I want to enlighten those who are non-enlightened. I am trying to do that. Sir,, my understanding of non-alighment is that it is not a static or a dogmatic policy. It is dynamic; it is not dogmatic. What happened during the Cold War period? There is no Cold War now because it is a unipolar world. At that time, it was bipolar. At that time, non-alignment never meant being

equidistance from both the powers. Rather non-alignment meant calling a spade a spade; we stood for the Third World; we stood for justice; and if the United States, or, for that matter, the Soviet Union commited any mistake, it was for us to tell them that this was wrong; we stood for justice and we stand for what is right even today. That is what non-alignment is. Therefore, there are two arguments. Number one, there is dilution of non-alignment, also they pooh-pooh the idea of enlightened nationalism. I want to understand both these arguments in my own way, and I am trying to do that. First of all, I would like to ask my Left friends, let us think of China. According to me, China is a Communist country. Even today, politically, it is a Communist country. I have a lot of admiration for China. I was so anxious to see China, and I went there. In Malayalam, we have a good Chinese song also. I have got Chinese vessels in my house. Even now, we have got a Chinese jar. It is a big jar, and it is called Chinese jar. What I am saying is this.What did China do in the eighties'? Please remember, China received the American President Nixon, although America was trying to exterminate Communism's from the face of the earth. The head of that State, i.e. USA was invited and received by China. I say, that was in China's national interest. That is enlightened national interest. Number two, I would like to say, I am not an economist, but I understand that the Marxian Economists never justifies imperialist capitalism. But, when China found that it is in the interest of the Chinese people, and in the interest of the Chinese nation, they found that there is no harm in accepting imperialistic capital. And, by accepting that imperialistic capital, I mean, foreign investment from USA. China's economy has grown like anything. They have gone much ahead of us, and they are going to be the second largest economic power in the world.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Because of American capital

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: I am not saying that. But, they have received it. China has grown much faster because it opened up to the foreign investment. I am not saying 'American only'. But, because my good learned friend, Brindaji asked me whether it is because of the American capital, then, I will answer you. What happened to the Soviet Union? The Soviet Union, with all its technology, with all its land mass which is nine times, more that that of ours, collapsed because the Soviet Union did not see the writing on the wall, and did not change. And, China changed. I welcome China. What China has done is correct. It says, it is enlightened nationalism. That is what was in China's national interest. That is what China has shown. What else is that? Let me ask one thing. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

...(*Interruptions*)...

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Kurian, you carry on. You address the Chair. You will be distracted, if you look towards them.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Therefore, what I am saying is this. Dogmatic approach, when you deal with national issues and national interest will not take you anywhere. You have to be pragmatic, and the pragmatic approach is in the best interest of the national, without sacrificing the fundamentals, the basic principles. That is enlightened nationalism. I will say one thing. Sir, after the Chinese aggression — in any case, it was in my mind — what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru did is this. We were non-aligned; we were not with any bloc. Rather, we were attributed to be siding with the Soviet Union. But we were non-aligned, perfectly. But, after the Chinese aggression, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru found nothing wrong in accepting weapons from the U.S. Dipankarji, you should listen. Do you criticise this? He accepted weapons from the U.S. Nobody said that it was a dilution of NAM-principle because that was the pragmatic approach, nothing but enlightened nationalism. We are implementing and continuing with the enlightened national interest from day one. There is no deviation, there is no change from that basic policy which we are following. Therefore, all this approach, as if we have diluted it, is wrong.

Sir, my next point is, it is said that bacause you do not accept U.S.A.'s action in Iraq, you should not have any deal with them, you should not have any agreement with them. This is the agrument that has been made here. Then, let me ask one question. Today, I read in the newspapers that we are having the seventh round of discussions with China on the border dispute. Thanks to our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Ministry, the discussion is in Kumarakam, Kerala, for which we are grateful. The seventh round of discussions are going on. I would like to mention here that the credit for that goes to the U.P.A. Government and the late Rajiv Gandhi, who started it. We know about the border dispute. I do not want to say about it because everybody knows about it. Rajivji wanted to settle the border dispute. The same thing has been said by the Leader of the Opposition, that we want to settle it. So, Rajivji sincerely tried for it. He started the dialogue. He visited China. A new era or phase was brought in.

Further, our Prime Minister, as also our UPA Chairperson, both took initiative and the 7th round Table Conference is going on. I would like to say that we should have the best kind of relations. If at all we should have the best kind of relations with any country, I would say that it should be

with China. Today, our trade with China—I have seen in the Economic Survey that China is the second largest trading partner, next only to the U.S.A. the trade balance is not in our favour; but, in any case, I am not grudging that. Therefore, with China also we should have agreements. I do not think my Left friends will object if we go in for an agreement with China. I think, they will all be happy. Then, some other people can say one thing: "Why do you go with China? What did China do inTibet? Why do you go there? Do you agre with what China did in Tibet? Some others can ask: " Why do you agree with China? What did China do inTiananmen Square? Do you agree with them?" Sir, we do not agree to both these things. Still, we want settlement with China, in our national interest and for the sake of peace.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time would you take Mr. Kurian?

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Sir, as much as you allow!

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Already you have taken 28 minutes; there are three more speakers from your party. Kindly conclude.

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Okey, Sir, I will conclude ina couple of minutes.

Sir, what I said is, in this age of technology advancement, when we know that the economic strength is the first strength, economic security is the first security, looking back on certain incidents or analysing a country's position with regard to what they are doing elsewhere and then arriving at a decision on whether we should deal with them or not, is not a pragmatic approach. We cannot be dogmatic because dogmas have no much price. Then, Sir, the operation of Foreign Policy, the working of the Ministry of External Affairs, about which I would say only two or three things since you have said that I have two or three minutes more. So, I am concluding, I am trying to conclude. I would say that since the UPA Government has assumed power, there is progress in every field with USA and you will agree with it. That is your allegation also. We are not going only with USA but our relations with Russia also have improved. So,see our relations with Russia also. What do you say about it? Now, take China about which I have already said that our relations are improving. Further, our relations with all our neighbours have improved. I would say, even with Myanmar, our position has improved and with Bangladesh also our relations have improved. Now, you come to Pakistan. People to people contact and dialogue are on the increase. At the same time, our Prime Minister has made it very clear that there can be no compromise on cross-border terrorism. We will deal with that. At the same time, I do not know the

names of the places between which bus service has started operating. ...(*Interruptions*)... Between Lahore ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amritsar. ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Rail link has started for Munavar ...(*Interruptions*)... That means with Pakistan also our relations are improving. Tell me please, after the UPA Government has assumed power, which is the country with which our relations have degraded or spoiled? I do not see any country ...(*Interruptions*)... What else is needed? Sir, foreign policy means that we have to have good relations with our neighbours, but at the same time, we should protect our national interest. Then, Sir further I would say that even now the basis of our foreign policy is Non-alignment itself. Therefore, NAM Movement and non-alignment should be strengthened. But what is that? This non-alignment policy is only a projection of our domestic policy and its root; its philosophy is taken from the Freedom Struggle, Sir, because we fought the British with a weapon of non-violence. That is why we are for peace, that is why we are for disarmament, that is why we are for dialogue. We reiterate, always reiterate that disputes have to be settled through dialogue and by not using weapons. We are for disarmament, it was late Rajiv Gandhi, our beloved leader, who presented the Disarmament Plan in the UN to eradicate from the globe nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, it has not come true, but still our aim is to achieve that end. We are not for nuclear proliferation. Even though we have nuclear bomb, we have declared that we will not be the first user. We will not use it first. Therefore, we stick to the principle of non-alignment. To say that we have diluted non-alignment, is again a travesty of truth and that is what I want to highlight. Then again I cannot stop myself from saying a word about the Gulf. I have to say it because you know, Sir, millions of our people are working in the guld countries and quite a good number of them are from South, especially Kerala. The External Affairs Ministry is mainly dealing with it. Now, there is also a new Ministry for the NRIs, non-resident Indians. First, I thank the Prime Minister and the UPA Government for constituting a new Department of NRI Affairs and appointing a Cabinet Minister for that. For the first time, ...(*Interruptions*)... He is from Kerala. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Vayalar Ravi is my leader also. Sir, I am saying that for that I thank the Prime Minister for showing his concern towards the toiling Indians who are working there. They have a lot of problems. Now, Mr. E. Ahammed, again a Minister from Kerala is well versed with the subject. He is also here. I have one or two requests. The first one is that most of the Malayalis working in the Gulf are not educated. They are skilled workers. They are SSLC pass or SSLC

failed. They don't know English or Hindi very well. They have problems in the Consulates or in the Embassies. Almost all the staff are people not knowing Malayalam. Please post one or two Malayalam knowing officers, at least, in the visa section, the consular section in the Gulf Embassies. That is one request of mine. There is only one more request. I thank the Prime Minister. He announced here and outside also that the Bill in the voting right for NRIs will be passed. That Bill is being introduced.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That Bill has already been introduced.

PROF. P. J. KURIAN: I thank the Prime Minister for getting it introduced. I request that the Bill should be passed during this Session itself. With these words, I support the demand of the External Affairs Minister and I would say that the External Affairs Minister under the leadership of the Prime Minister is doing very well. That is the real feeling of the people of this country. With these words, I conclude. Thank you very much, Sir.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I would like to begin by actually thanking the Leader of the Opposition unfortunately, in his absence--and in the absence of most of them here-- for raising many issues which will give us the opportunity also to clarify and to have an informed and enlightened debate in the House on Foreign Policy. I would also like to thank Prof. Kurian because I had a very difficult task to extract what he said about the foreign policy between Kerala, Gulf and China, I mean, what he actually was talking about our foreign policy. But, Sir, let me begin with the observation made by the Leader of the Opposition when he talked of idealistic and realistic schools of thought regarding foreign policy and that he rather be a realist than be an idealist. And, he implied, imputed that the Left is trying to be an obstacle in the pursuit of a good foreign policy which the Government is pursuing. That the Left allies are crippling what he says is the pursuit of this policy. Let me begin with this thing, Sir, idealistic and realistic are terms that are often used when you want to desagree with the position of somebody else, you say he is an idealist, he is not real. Therefor he is unreal, therefore his view is wrong. And a realist is somebody, who we are told, who adapts to existing realities and therefore, he takes forward the momentum of existing world. But Sir, taking forward the momentum of existing world or being a realist also has an objective where you want to take this world to. You cannot be a realist unless you are an idealist and unless you want to know where you want to take this world to, otherwise, realism that we are opposed to and therefore, we say, 'yes, we are idealist'. We want this world to go in this direction and we want to take the world to

go in that direction. Therefor, we engage with the existing realities in order to change them. That is the way in which we want the foreign policy to move, not to succumb to existing realities of the single power domination of the empire that the Leader of the Opposition talked of and not to succumb to that is the element of idealism, I think, which is the quintessential path of India's enlightened nationalism and it is that essential path of India's enlightened nationalism that we are today upholding as against the effort in the name of realism to surrender that enlightened nationalism. Therefore, Sir, the debate is not really between idealism and realism. The debate is definitely, in terms of national interest, in terms of national security, in terms of economic security, in terms of energy security; and energy and economic security constitute for foundational pillar for India's foreign policy and future as well. Definitely, on that, there is absolutely no dispute. But, where I want to draw this distinction about realism with which the Leader of the Opposition began is that you realism cannot change depending on which side of the House you are sitting on. When you are on the Treasury Benches your realism is something else. When you are on the Opposition Benches you realism is something else. And, here, he mentioned five points. I think, I would, actually agree with him on all these five points. That is why I wish that he did not very tentatively end himself without taking, actually, a position of what should be the position of the India's Foreign Policy *vis-a-vis* the USA. And, what are those five points? First, he says that India has become a willing partner of double standards of the USA. Secondly, he said, 'the USA is practising political hegemony in the world.' The third point he says, 'Why USA agreed for this pact with India and why Mr. Bush's visit was a success is because the US's Foreign Policy has failures elsewhere in this world and this is the only area where they can get a success. And, therefore, the USA agreed. It has nothing to do with India or our national interest.' He contradicts himself when he says that. Then, he makes another statement. He says, "India is in the US yard today." I mean he has gone even beyond me in suggesting that India has gone into the USA yard today. And, finally, having spent six laborious years in trying to make the USA give a certificate to Pakistan saying it is a terrorist State, he now says that the question of Pakistan should not be brought about with the USA at all. Now, fine, I mean, the people are willing to change. They are most welcome to change. But, is this change consistent? Is this anti-US position that they are taking today is stopping short of what we are saying? Why I had laboured on this point is only to establish that what we are saying is not something that is born of ideology or idealism. Those who accuse us of ideology or idealism reasons are the

ones who are, actually, practising an ideology and that ideology they want to mask by attacking us saying that we are practising a certaing ideological point. Why I am saying this is that it stems not from the Communist Manifesto. It does not stem from any writings of Karl Marx. Sir, this is the Annual Report of your Ministry of External Affairs for 2005-06. Here, in the Summary of India's Foreign Policy, It says and I quote, "In this tangibly transforming international environment, the fundamental tenets of India's Foreign Policy have retained their essential validity. Autonomy in decision-making, the commitment to the Panchsheel or Five Principles of peaceful coexistence, friendly and cooperative relations with all countries, resolution of conflicts through dialogue and peaceful means..."--which means, not through confrontation-- "...and equity in conduct of international relations. The NCMP of the UPA has reaffirmed these basic principles." This is the opening. This is the salvo of this Report.

Now, Sir, when it comes to relations with the USA, it must be counter posed with what this Report itself says. I quote, "The bilateral relationship between India and the USA make a commitment to transform the steadily glowing bilateral ties into a strategic partnership and also saw the growing convergence of views on global, regional and bilateral issues." On the one hand, you talk of autonomy in decision-making and relations with all countries and, on the other hand, in the same report, you talk of growing convergence on all issue; not merely on some specific issues, but you talk on global, on regional and on bilateral issues. What are the other issues? They are strategic and security issues, Defence, counter terrorism, counter proliferation, trade and investment, science, technology, etc. So far, on every score, which is related to international developments, you, now, see a convergence of interests with the USA. Now, this counter pose with all that we have discussed or we have heard here and we have discussed this even in the earlier debates, is in a situation where the USA, today, is seeking to impose its political, military hegemonism through 702 military bases in the world! It has military bases in 132 countries! Is this for the spread of democracy? When you talk convergence of interest in fighting terrorism, you talk of 9/11. But, you forget, there is also another 9/11. Sir, 09-11-1973 was the day when Salvador Allande was overthrown in a CIA-led coup in Chile and in that single night in the football stadium in Santiago, Chile, more than 100,000 people were butchered in the name of defending democracy and pulling down a socialist Government which was duly elected by the people. What else is this, but counter terrorism; what else is this, but State terrorism! When you talk of terrorist attacks on the US remember State terrorism on the one hand, and the individual terrorism

on the other hand. They feed each other. We cannot, today, subscribe to converge our interests with State terrorism, while opposing individual terrorism. That sort of a convergence is not in the interest of enlightened nationalism of India. And, that is why, I mean, what we are stating is that in the Foreign Policy direction, you are talking about the equation that you have with the United States. Please, by all means, have friendly relations, nobody is saying 'no', but the cost of our economic security cannot supersede the cost of our dignity to live in this world on the basis of our individual assessments and not succumbing to anybody's dictums. And, that is the point at issue. That is why we cannot be a party to any 'carrot and stick policy' that we will give you this; in return, you support us on these measures. And, that is the warning that we want to give to this Government that we cannot succumb to this, because the matter does not end here. It goes on an ahead because the Government itself talks about two other issues, which I want to talk about. We heard from the Leader of he Opposition that India is at a tri-section of three empires that have collapsed. But from this tri-section of the three world empires he, unfortunately, did not outline the vision of what ought to be India's Foreign Policy in that situation. And, that is what I would like to do, as a part again of enlightened nationalism, and not as a part of any Left doctrine, in the world situation that you have today after the demise of the bipolar situation of the Cold war. The bipolarity, in the world, today, had ended. The natural tendency in the world ought to be a movement in international relations towards multipolarity. And, instead of allowing this normal movement of international relations towards multipolarity, the United States of America intervences to convert this movement towards multipolarity into a movement towards unipolarity. Do we subscribe to that movement towards unipolarity? That is the question that enlightened nationalism has to answer. Today, out approach, and I am just carrying forward to what he has stopped short of, and that is the logical conclusion, that in today's condition, in today's world, in today's realities, if we are to exist as a country with our self-esteem and out position in the wrold, then, India must unhesitatingly, and without any vacillation whatsoever, advance movements towards multipolarity and not succumb to unipolarity. And, it is that which is the hallmark, I think, of this elightened nationalism that we have talked about. And, then, again, you talk in terms of United Nations reforms, and not going into the details of it. You talk of various other things about multilateralism etc. But, then, why I am saying that in this movement towards unipolarity, we should not subscribe to that, and instead work for

multipolarity. In this background, I want to draw the attention of the very strange development that has taken place. And,this is what the Report says, I am quoting. "The Indian Prime Minister was called upon by the UN Secretary General, along with other leaders to launch the UN democracy fund, to which India's initial contribution is 10 million dollars." What this Report does not say, Sir, is that this 'ten million' is the highest in the world. There is only one equivalent to this 'ten million', the United States of America; otherwise, we, along with the USA, have contributed the highest, But this global democracy initiative has come as a part of President Bush's speech, one of his earlier speeches, when he said that he wanted to spread democracy all over the world. And, here, in our country, using our soil, he talked of spreading democracy in countries like Cuba; in countries like North Korea; in countries like Iran. And, it is this doctrine that they are holding today, which we have become party to it, paying ten million. And, being party to, are we, today, furthering multipolarity, or, are we furthering unipolarity? A country which has openly given itself a policy of saying' my doctrine of pre-emptive strike'; has given itself a policy of 'my doctrine of regime change'. It is announced on our soil, at least five countries in the world which have duly elected Government that they want to work for a regime change there. It has sought the permission of the US Senate for eighty-five million dollars for a regime change in Iran. Are we subscribing to that world view, Sir? What is the convergence that we are talking about? What is the mvoement towards multipolarity that we are talking about, except that you are surrendering to this unipolarity? And it is this surrender to unipolarity, where, we think, Sir, lies a direct contradistinction with our own evolved foreign policy, which is part of that enlightened nationalism. And, it is here, Sir, that I would want to draw the attention of the Government also towards what Prof. Kurian said, that often people here keep saying. "..but China is doing this. But the Soviet Union has done that in the past." But, please, Sir, as far as the CPI (M) is concerned, let me again put it on record in this House, the CPI (M) was born out of a struggle when both the dominant parties of the Soviet Union and China had opposed our formation. And, we have existed in our country only because we are Indians, neither Russian nor Chinese. And, we have become a strong party here, So, we have our own history, we have our contemporary history. So, do not teach us lessons on foreign policy through some other country. Please teach us, here in India, how this is actually in our favour when I am saying, I think is not in our favour. And, that is the point at issue, Sir, which is what should be the cardinal point in our discussions, in our foreign policy. So, please, let us not bring any extraneous issues.

And, when we talk about that, Sir, my final point on this entire aspect here is that let us not today have this very perverted concept of enlightened nationalism where this enlightened nationalism converts Non-Alignment into non-enlightenment and it is that conversion that is taking place in our foreign policy according to me, and that is what we have to be very careful about and stop ourselves in the tracks if we are moving in the wrong direction. And, therefore, keep the interest of our country supreme. There is absolutely no doubt about it. That is why we have gone through this debate on Iran and on the nuclear deal. So,I do not want to repeat those aspects of it. That is why, keeping this in mind, that should be the direction of our foreign policy and not otherwise.

Sir, there are some other issues here which I also want to mention. We have talked in terms of nuclear disarmament. We talked of Iran. This issues has come, but again I find it very strange, Sir, there is again no reference to the Rajiv Gandhi Plan of universal nuclear disarmament in this report. And, again, it appears as though we have now somehow been satisfied that there is a backdoor entry for India into a nuclear weapon state; that recognition is there. Therefore, we will no longer raise the issue of nuclear disarmament or global disarmament. That is something which will be unfortunate if we do that. And, I think, we should correct ourselves on the tracks if that omission is there.

But, Sir, more importantly there are two other aspects I would like to take up. One is regarding our neighbours. Regarding our neighbours some points have been made, very correctly, that India today is encircled, in one sense, by a degree of hostility in some of our neighbouring countries with whom we want best of our relations. We want the best of our good neighbourly relations with all these countries. But the report here regarding Bangladesh says and I am quoting: "The spurt in violence and extremism, as also the continued operation of forces inimical to India from Bangladesh soil, have been a cause for concern." It is very true. But, what are we doing about it? I can come down from foreign policy to domestic policy. Our CPM led State Governments, both in Bengal and Tripura have actually given details of how, it is not correct to give those details in this House, actual detailed maps have been provided; where these locations are, and where this training comes from. People have been acting against our interest. But, what step is the Government taking about this? What happening? On that there is a complete silence. It will do good to this House to know about this.

Secondly, with regard to Nepal the report says and I quote: "India stands ready to support all efforts aimed at bringing about a peaceful resoulution to the problems confronting Nepal." It is very true, very correct. But, if these reports are correct, then, what the Leader of the Opposition has informed the House today, I do not know what is the validity of that. The Government will have to answer that. That India has invited the leaders of Maoists groups in Nepal and other political parties for discussions on the Indian soil. If that is going forward, then, what are the diplomatic efforts that India has been making on this? We have stated very clearly, Sir, that the King of Nepal cannot be given legitimacy by India, in any form, for the abrogation of democracy that he is undertaking. And that is a position which includes the cutting off of also the military supplies to Nepal and the suspension of that. This should continue till democarcy is restored in Nepal and that is the position, I think, we should continue with.

Now, there is a Look East policy. In this Look East Policy, yes, some initiatives have been taken, and, something have been talked about which is good. We would appreciate if the Government takes these intiatives further, and, then, actually, cements the Look East Policy direction. But, what I am more concerned is, Sir, that, in the report, there is also a Look West Policy. Very few are talking about the Look West Policy. Therefore, since it is a look West Policy, I will just read out what it says. " The Look West Policy that India has launched is premised upon the facts that the Gulf region signifies for India in major economic partner-- and Prof. Kurian, please note -- but is a host to over four million Indian expatriates, and a vital source of India's energy security. " Now, this is the Look West Policy. Then, it proceeds to go on talking about various Western countries, and then, about Iran, What does the report say? " The two countries are commited to strengthen the bonds of friendship for mutual prosperity an peace an stability in the region. And, then, etc., etc., which the Prime Minister also while making the Statement on Iran has said. But, Sir, on this entire issue of the vote on Iran, I do not want to repeat what has been said in this House earlier. But the entire Look West Policy of India, Sir, I think, is being severely jeopardised by the action that is widely perceived as an action that we have taken under the pressure from the United States of America. And, it is this, unfortunately, which will derail the direction of our Foreign Policy from what we ourselves have maintained, and we ourselves have stated here. So, on all these aspects, Sir, whether it is a question of relationship with our neighbours, whether it is a question of our Look West Policy and Look East Policy, one thing that has to be remembered, Sir, is that India's prestige in the world lies because of our

enlightened nationalism, how we emerged as one of the key leaders of the developing world. If that, in any way, is compromised, Sir, I don't think that dreams of India entering the United Nation's Security Council will ever meterialise. We will enter the United Nation's Security Council, not as a tutelage of United States of America, we will enter it as a leader of the developing world. We have to remember that. We have to remember that. We cannot alienate the entire developing world at the expense of currying favour with the United State of America. Then, your own objective is self-defeating. You are just cutting the branch on which you are sitting. So, what we want to urge upon the Government is, yes by all means, develop your relations; by all means, let us strengthen our economic and energy security, but, also remember that the shortcoming in our energy security, nuclear energy security has not been because of shortage of uranium. We heard the debate the other day. Not once did your Committee report tell you that there was a shortage of uranium. Not once did your Committee report tell you that you were hemmed in by the Americans; and, therefore, you could not produce.What you wanted to produce. All that has been said is that there has been a shortage of funds because of which we could not produce. This is a Standing Committee Report which you have read out in the last three years. Now, if that is the thing, correction must come there. Correction is not to accept the US conditions. So, therefore, Sir, finally, I would only like to state here that whether it is a question of United Nations Security council membership, whether it is a question of universal disarmament, nuclear disarmament, whether it is a question of multi-lateralism being the only way in today"s world which is what this report says, all this is compromised with a sudden closeness that has appeared. We are not complaining about the closeness. What we are complaining about is succumbing to pressures that will come as a result of the closeness with the United States of America. And that is why I repeat, as I said, this carrot and stick policy is what we have got to be wary of and this Government must do everything in order to ensure that we don't get the wrong and of the stick while we just keep watching the carrot, and then we continue to be pushed by the United States of America in this direction. Therefore, Sir, finally, in conclusion, I would only urge since the Prime Minister was patient enough to virtually hear all these speeches here that the debate on Foreign Policy, —very important for the future of the country -- will have to stick, Sir, as the Report here says, to our well-defined objectives which include our improvement in relations with all countries, including the United States of America. This is a quotation from the National Common Minimum Programme. All countries including, not with the USA's strategic partnership excluding. So this will be a departure

2.00 PM

from our National Common Minimum Programme, which in something that cannot be accepted. Therefore, keeping that in mind, I think, the Foreign Policy initiatives will have to move with our time-tested principles that relations with all countries, the Panchscheel, multi-lateralism as the mainstay for international relations and all disputes to be resolved through discussions and dialogues and not confrontation. And that is why India, should not, in any way, be partly to the repetition of what happened with Iraq, which is what the USA is envisaging with Iran now. We must be very clear and not caught in a situation that we will only pass a unanimous Resolution after an attack on Iran and after Iran's occupation, like it happened in Iraq, but from the beginning, we have to warm the world that we are not going to be party to anything of this sort, of any sanctions or attacks on Iran. Thank you, Sir.

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): डिप्टी चेयरमैन सर, मैं आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रगुजार हूँ, जो आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। आज मुझे यहां फॉरेन पॉलिसी के ऊपर कुछ बहुत ही एनलाइटनिंग थीसिस सुनने को मिली, इंटरनेशलन पावर प्ले जिस तरह हो रहा है,उसके बारे में सुनने को मिला। मैं चाहता था कि डिसकशन फॉरेन मिनिस्टरी की वर्किंग के ऊपर होती उसकी वर्किंग की गड़बड़ी के बारे में होती, लेकिन यहां ज्यादातर फॉरेन पॉलिसी के ऊपर ही बात हुई, तो मैं भी अपने को रोक नहीं पा रहा हूँ कि फॉरेन पॉलिसी के ऊपर बात न करूं।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो॰ पी॰जे॰ कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए]

सर, आज हिंदुस्तान में ही नहीं, पूरी दुनिया में फॉरेन पॉलिसी इकोनोमिक पॉलिसी का हिस्सा बन गई है और इसलिए फॉरेन पॉलिसी की अहमियत बहुत ज्यादा है। मुझे लगता है कि शायद फॉरेन पॉलिसी की अहमियत को समझते हुए हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी ने इस वक्त कोई फॉरेन मिनिस्टर नहीं रखा है, खुद अपने पास इस पद को रख लिया है ताकि इस पर ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जा सके। आज जो फॉरेन मिनिस्टर को फोकस हो गया है, वह बहुत टैक्नीकली हो गया है, बहुत स्पेशलाइज्ड भी हो गया है, उसके साथ इकानोमिक्स भी जुड़ गया है, लेकिन कभी भी फॉरेन पॉलिसी को आप इंटरनल पॉलिसी से न अलग कर सके हैं और न अलग कर सकेंगे। फॉरेन पॉलिसी रिफलेक्शन होती है इंटरनल पॉलिसी की, इसलिए जब एनलाइटेन्ड सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट की बात करते हैं जरूर बात कीजिए कोई नई बात नहीं है, यह जो कहा जा रहा है कि आज हम यह एनलाइटेन्ड सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट की बात कर रहे हैं, आज रियलिस्टिक पॉलिसी की बात कर रहे हैं तो पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू भी रियलिस्टिक थे, पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू भी उस वक्त बाइपोलार वर्ल्ड में नोन-एलाइनमेंट का क्वैश्चन लेकर चले थे। वह सिर्फ आइडियलिज्म की वजह से नहीं था, नोन-एलाइनमेंट की बात रियलिज्म के साथ जुड़ी हुई थी इसलिए यह कहना कि हम रियलिस्टिक हो गए हैं इसके पहले रियलिस्टिक पॉलिसी नहीं थी, मैं इस बात से एग्री नहीं करता हूँ और इसलिए यह कहना चाहता हूँ

कि हमें अपने एनलाइटेन्ड सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट को देखते हुए यह भी देखना होगा कि हमारी पॉलिसी प्योर डेड एप्रोचिनिज्म में तो नहीं बदल रही, कहीं। हम एनलाइटेन्ड सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट की बात करके एप्रोचनिज्म की बात तो नहीं कर रहे हैं, इस बात का हमें ध्यान रखना होगा। मुझे डर लगता है कि हम बहुत सारी चीजें मोरली जस्टिफाई नहीं कर सकते, आइडोलोजी जस्टिफाई नहीं कर सकते, हिस्टोरिकल जस्टीफाई नहीं कर सकते, उन्हें जस्टिफाई करने के लिए हमने एक फिगलीफ ढूंढ लिया है अपने नंगेपन को छुपाने के लिए और उसका नाम हमने रख दिया है एनलाइटन सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट। इससे हमें होशियार रहने की जरूरत है।

सर, दूसरी बात यह कही जाती है कि यह एनलाइटन सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट जो है, सिर्फ हमारे देश के इंटरेस्ट में होगा, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि दुनिया की सारी जगह, सारी कंट्रीज में फॉरेन पॉलिसी इंटरनल पुल्स एंड प्रेसर्स से इनफ्ल्यूएन्स करती है। युनाइटेड स्टेट्स की पॉलिसी वहां की जूइस लॉबी इनफ्ल्यूएन्स करती है और वहीं की ही नहीं बल्कि मुझे लगता है कि हमारी फॉरेन पॉलिसी को भी जुइस लॉबी इनफ्ल्यूएन्स करने की कोशिश करती है। यही कारण है कि पिछले दो-तीन सालों में हमारे जो फॉरेन मिनिस्टर रहे हैं, वे वहां जाकर जुइस लॉबी, अमेरिकन जुइस लॉबी के सामने पेश होते रहे हैं और अपनी बात रखते रहे हैं। इसलिए यह कहना कि हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर क्या रहा है, हिन्दुस्तान में माइनोरिटीज क्या सोच रही हैं, हिन्दुस्तान में डिफरेंट सेक्शन्स क्या सोच रहे हैं, हमारे रिलेशन अरब के साथ क्या हैं, इसका इनफ्ल्यूएन्स नहीं होगा, We will go just by cold-blooded analysis of our lelf-interest. I do not agree with that.

सर, मैं येचुरी जी की इस बात का समर्थन करते हुए यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अमरीका के साथ हमारे जो रिश्ते हैं, उनसे हम तलवार की धार पर चल रहे हैं। यह double-edged sword है और हमें इस तलवार की धार पर बहुत फूंक-फूंक कर कदम रखना होगा। अगर हम ज्यादा क्लोज़ होते हैं, तब भी हमारे कटने का खतरा है और अगर हम ज्यादा डिस्टेंस रखते हैं, तब भी हमें नुकसान पहुंचने का खतरा है। इसलिए यह समझ लेना कि अमरीका से बहुत नज़दीकी, मैं यह नहीं कहूंगा कि जो हमारी फॉरेन मिनिस्ट्री से डील कर रहे हैं, वे उन पिटफॉल्स को समझते हैं, लेकिन खास तौर पर हमारी मिडल क्लास के अन्दर एक यह एहसास पैदा हो रहा है कि अमरीका से कुरबत हमारे नैशनल इंटरेस्ट में है। मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अमरीका के दोस्त, जो अमरीका के बहुत क्लोज़ हैं, वे भी अमरीका से अपना डिस्टेंस बना रहे हैं, वे भी बुश एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के बहुत ज्यादा करीब नहीं आना चाह रहे हैं। जब मैं अमरीका कहता हूं, what I mean is the Bush Administration. क्योंकि हम, हमारी पार्टी और इस पार्लियामेंट हाउस में बैठे हुए तमाम लोग अमरीका से दोस्ती के पूरी तरह से समर्थक हैं। अमरीकन लोगों के साथ दोस्ती के समर्थक हैं, अमरीकन कांस्टीट्यूशन और अमरीकन हिस्ट्री के जो प्रिंसिपल्स हैं, उनके साथ we are one with them, लेकिन अगर हम विरोध करते हैं तो इस मौजूदा एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की पॉलिसीज़ का। खुद अमरीका के अन्दर लोग इस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन से दूर हटना चाह रहे हैं। इन हालात में हम अगर अपने को अमरीका के बहुत ज्यादा करीब दिखा कर खुश होते हैं, तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह बहुत समझदारी की बात नहीं है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आज अमेरिकन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन जिस

लड़ाई की बात कर रहा है, उनकी लड़ाई कोई सोवियत यूनियन के साथ नहीं है या किसी एक देश के साथ नहीं है, आज वे सिविलाइज़ेशनल वॉर की बात कर रहे हैं। आज वहां पर यह कहा जा रहा है कि पचास साल तक यह लड़ाई चलेगी और कुछ एनालिस्ट ऐसे भी हैं, जो सिविलाइज़ेशन्स के बीच हज़ार साल की लड़ाई की बात कर रहे हैं। यह नहीं मालूम कि दुश्मन कौन है, किससे लड़ रहे हो, किस पर हमला करना है, कहां लड़ना हैं। यह लड़ाई एक आइडियोलॉजी से है, एक आइडिया से है, एक कॉन्सेप्ट से है। क्या हम इस लड़ाई में हिस्सेदार बनने वाले हैं? मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बहुत ही खतरनाक कॉन्सैप्ट है, बहुत ही खतरनाक लड़ाई की बात है और अगर हम इस लड़ाई का हिस्सा बनते हैं तो हमें इसकी भारी कीमत चुकानी पड़ सकती है। यहां पर जब सिविलाइज़ेशन वॉर की बात हो रही है, मैं यह साफ कर देना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की लड़ाई न इस्लामिक फंडामेंटलिज्म से हैं और न ही सो कॉल्ड इस्लामिक टैररिज्म से हैं। हमारी लड़ाई 'टेररिज्म' से है, लेकिन इस्लामिक टैररिज्म, जिसका इस्तेमाल प्रैज़िडेंट बुश बार-बार करते हैं और मैं याद दिलाना चाहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान आने से दो-तीन दिन पहले एशिया सोसाइटी की मीटिंग में जब प्रैज़िडेंट बुश ने टेररिज़्म, की बात की और कई बार उन्होंने इस टैररिज्म शब्द का प्रयोग किया तो उन्होंने कभी टेररिज्म नहीं कहा, उन्होंने कहा कि India and the US are together in the fight against Islamic terrorism. मैं मंत्री जी से और सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि are we together in this fight against 'Islamic terrorism' or 'terrorism'? हमें अपने इंटर्नल इंटरेस्ट्स और इंटरनेशनल इंटररेस्ट्स में इस बात को बहुत क्लीयर करके चलना पड़ेगा। अगर हम इसे क्लीयर नहीं करेंगे तो मैं आपको बता दूं कि यह एक ट्रैप है और इस ट्रैप के अन्दर हम फंसते चले जाएंगे और मुझे लगता है कि अमरीका खुद अपने लिए ही इस ट्रैप को खोद रहा हैं वह अपने लिए एक गडढा खोद रहा है और अगर एलाइज़ भी आंख खोल कर नहीं चलेंगे तो उस गड्ढे के अंदर उनके भी और हमारे भी गिरने का खतरा है। इसलिए मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहूंगा कि अपनी फॉरेन पॉलिसी को बनाने हुए हम इन बातों का बहुत ध्यान रखते हुए चलें।

येचुरी जी ने कहा कि हमारा जो फोकस है, वह मल्टी पोलर वर्ल्ड बनाने का है और मैं खास तौर से मिनिस्ट्री का ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहूंगा कि हमारी एक्सटर्नल एफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री की जो फंक्शनिंग है, वह यूरो सेंट्रिक है और यूएस सेंट्रिक है। इसका नतीजा यह है कि हमारा फोकस इन्हीं देशों के ऊपर रहता है और उसके बाद जब हम सेक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में आने के लिए लड़ाई लड़ते हैं, तब हम कहते हैं कि अफ्रीका हमारे साथ नहीं आता। जब हमारा ध्यान अफ्रीका पर होता ही नहीं तब अफ्रीका हमारे साथ क्यों आएगा? यहां पर मिनिस्टर साहब से मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आप मिनिस्ट्री में भी इस चीज़ को देखिए कि मिनिस्ट्री के अन्दर लोग अफ्रीका की पोस्टिंग ही नहीं लेना चाहते हैं, लैटिन अमरीका की पोस्टिंग ही नहीं लेना चाहते, उनका फोकस यूरोप और अमरीका की पोस्टिंग्स पर रहता हैं।

हमें यह फैसला करना है कि आने वाले समय में अगर हम एक मल्टी पोलर वर्लड चाहते हैं तो उस मल्टी पोलर वर्ल्ड को बनाने में हमारा क्या रोल होगा? हमारा क्या फोकस होगा? हमारे नेबर्स का क्या रोल होगा? अफ्रीका, एशिया और लैटिन अमरीका के देशों का क्या रोल होगा? किस तरह से हम उनको अपने साथ ला सकते हैं? उनको अपने साथ लाने के लिए मिनिस्ट्री और मिनिस्टर्स अपनी पॉलिसीज़ में, अपने फोकस में और अपने टार्गेट्स में क्या चेंजिज़ ला रहे हैं? एक तो होती

है पौलिसी, पौलिसी चेंज करती है सिचुएशन के हिसाब से, लेकिन एक होता है लॉंग टर्म गोल्स, उन लॉंग टर्म गोल्स के लिए आपको मिनिस्ट्री के अंदर फोकस बनाकर चलना पड़ता है और वहां पर यह देखना पड़ता है कि आपके जो डेस्क हैं- अफ्रीका डेस्क और लैटिन अमेरिका डेस्क और एशिया डेस्क इसके ऊपर कितना ध्यान है और कितने ध्यान से हम किन लोगों को यहां पर रख रहे हैं, उन लोगों को हम कितनी इम्पोर्टेंस दे रहे हैं, कितना अहमियत दे रहे हैं, क्या हम यू॰एस॰ए॰ डेस्क और यूरोपियन डेस्क को ही बहुत ज्यादा अहमियत देते हैं। इसके लिए हमें बहुत ज्यादा ध्यान करने की और होशियार होने की जरूरत होगी। सर, हमारी जो पॉलिसी है उसको इस बात पर भी बहुत ध्यान करना होगा कि जब हम इकॉनोमिक पॉलिसी की बात करते हैं, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी बात को दोहरा रहा हूं, आपने जो कहा कि हमें यह देखना पड़ेगा कि इंटरेस्ट यू॰एस॰ए॰ से क्लोजनैस नहीं है या हमें यह भी देखना है कि इजरायल की तरफ हमारी पॉलिसी क्या होगी, हमें वेस्ट एशिया के अंदर, हम सिर्फ इससे सेटिस्फाई नहीं हो सकते कि वेस्ट एशिया में चूंकि कुछ अरब कन्ट्रीज भी प्रो-इजरायल पॉलिसी ले रहे हैं, इसलिए भ्पदकनेजंद्ू पसस विससवू जीमउण् हिन्दुस्तान फॉलो नहीं कर सकता उनको, हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी फॉरेन पौलिसी अपने तौर से लेकर चलनी होगी। इजरायल से क्लोजनैस भी उसी तरह से तलवार की धार है जिस तरह से अमेरिका के साथ हैं ज्यादा क्लोज नजर आए, कितना डिस्टेंस रखा नजर आए, यह बड़ा इम्पोर्टेंट है, बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। और इसलिए यह जो एक पौलिसी बन रही है क्योंकि हमारे लोग वहां काम कर रहे हैं, हमारा इकॉनोमिक इंटरेस्ट, हमारा जॉब सिक्योरिटी का इंटरेस्ट, हमारी इनर्जी सिक्योरिटी का इंटरेस्ट वैस्ट एशिया के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है। इसलिए इस देश में बहुत से लोग यह कहते नजर आते हैं कि प्दकपंदेए प्तंमसपे ंम उनबी बसवेमत पकमवसवहपमेए मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि कौन सी आइडियोलौजी, ऑकूपेशन की आइडियोलौजी, दूसरे कन्ट्रीज पर कब्जा करने आइडियोलौजी, डेमोक्रेसी को खत्म करने की आइडियोलौजी न्यूक्लिअर बम बनाने की आइडियोलौजी और एन॰पी॰टी॰ को फलॉप करने की आइडियोलौजी, यह इस आइडियोलौजी पर इंडिया और इजरायल क्या क्लोज हैं? अगर नहीं है तो हमारी क्लोजनैस वेस्ट एशिया से तो हो सकती है, क्ल्चरल, हिस्टोरिकल, इकॉनोमिक, सोशल और पॉलिटिकल, लेकिन इजरायल के साथ नहीं हो सकती। इसलिए हमें इस क्लोजनैस को बनाते वक्त एक थ्यौरी, अभी जसवन्त जी चले गए, बहुत से इनके दोस्तों ने भी थ्यौरी दी है, बहुत सी किताबें लिखी हैं। इजरायल, इंडिया और यू॰एस॰, नेच्युरल एलॉइज हैं, मैं चाहता हूं कि मिनिस्टर साहब से, ई॰ अहमद साहब का ध्यान अपनी तरफ चाहूंगा कि वे इस बात को क्लेरिफाइ करें कि क्या इंडिया, यू॰एस॰ए॰ और इजरायल नेच्युरल एलॉइज हैं, अगर नहीं हैं तो क्यों नहीं हैं, इसको क्लेरिफाइड करने की जरूरत है।

There are forces which are working in this direction, which are spreading this concept and this idea. And, we have to negate this idea in the interest of the country, in the enlightened self-interest of this country.

यह बात साफ करने के जरूरत है। सर, आखिर में मैं यह कहना चाहूगा कि मैं आखिरी आदमी हूंगा जो यह माने कि इस मुल्क की फॉरेन पौलिसी हिन्दुस्तान के इंटरेस्ट के अलावा ...(व्यवधान) बस, अब मैं दो मिनट और बोलूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो॰ पी॰ जे॰ कुरियन): जल्दी खत्म करें, आपका 11 मिनट का टाइम था, अभी 15 मिनट लिए हैं। अब दो मिनट और ले लें।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: आपका बहुत धन्यवाद, बहुत शुक्रगुजार कि आपने मेरे पर कृपा की तथा बोलने के लिए दो मिनट और दे दिया। वरना जिस तरह का आज सदन है, इस समय बोलने का कोई मन नहीं करता है। इसलिए बोलना होता है कि कुछ बातें कहनी हैं। मैं एक बात बहुत स्ट्रोंगली, बहुत मन से कहना चाह रहा हूं, महोदय मैं मंत्री जी का खास ध्यान आपके माध्यम से चाहता हूं कि हमें फॉरेन पॉलिसी को नेशनल कंसेसंस की पॉलिसी बनाकर चलना होगा। हममें इसमें जो एक आज प्रवृति बन रही है कि पौलिटिकल पार्टीज को हम कांफिडेंस में नहीं लेते हैं, उस तरह से जिस तरह से लेना चाहिए, उसके बाद हम पार्टीज से शिकायत करते हैं। यह फॉरेन पॉलिसी आज के लिए नहीं है हम आने वाली जेनरेशन का फैसला कर रहे हैं, चाहे यू॰ एस॰ ए॰ के साथ हमारे रिलेशंस हैं, चाहे न्यूक्लिअर डील है, चाहे ईरान के ऊपर वोट है, इससे हमारी आने वाली जेनरेशन का फैसला होने वाला है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से चाहूंगा कि आप, मैं इस बात के लिए अटल जी की तारीफ करता हूं कि अटल जी ने उस वक्त मे बहुत सारे मामलात थे, सारी पार्टियों को बुलाकर बात की। इसलिए आप इस पर बात कीजिए और दूसरी बात यह है कि जो विरोधी हैं, अगर आज आपकी पॉलिसी के कोई विरोधी हैं, तो विरोधी आइडियलॉजीकल हैं, वे भी हिन्दुस्तान के सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट में, इनलायर्टेड सेल्फ इंटरेस्ट में विरोध कर रहे हैं, आप उनके विरोध के पीछे मोटिव मत ढूंढिये। अगर मोटिव ढूंढेगे, तो जो एनलायर्टेड नेशनल कन्सेन्सस बनना चाहिए, वह नेशनल कन्सेसस ऐमर्ज नहीं करेगा, इसलिए मैं दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि किसी एक कम्युनिटी को, किसी एक ग्रुप को बुलाकर आप बात मत कीजिए हमारी फॉरेन पालिसी के बारे में, नहीं तो उसका फायदा, उन लोगों को मिलेगा जो हिन्दुस्तान का नुकसान पहुंचाना चाहते हैं । जो विरोध कर रहे हैं, आप उनको बुलाकर बात कीजिए, उनको बताइये कि क्यों विरोध है। हो सकता है कि आपकी बात समझें, हो सकता कि है कि आपकी बात न समझें, लेकिन किसी अलग-अलग कम्युनिटी को, अलग-अलग ग्रुप्स को बुलाकर बात करना बहुत डेंजरस है और इसके बहुत दूर तक, बहुत नुकसानदेह नतायज होंगे, इसलिए किसी एक कम्युनिटी से आप बात मत कीजिए। आखिर में, मै यह कहूंगा कि जरा अपनी फॉरेन पालिसी को, अपने नेबरहुड की तरफ ज्यादा लाइये। हम यह बात हर बार, हर डिबेट में कहते हैं, लेकिन ऐसा हमें नजर नहीं आता है और हो यह रहा है कि हमारे चारों तरफ आग लगी हुई है । आज हम कहते हैं कि हम इकोनामिक सुपरपावर बनने वाले हैं, मुझे नहीं लगता कि अगर हमारे पड़ौसी, हमारे साथ नहीं होंगे। हम अपने पड़ौसियों का इकोनामिकली साथ लेकर नहीं चल सकेंगे, तो हिन्दुस्तान भी आगे नहीं बढ़ पायेगा, उस बेस पर, जिस पर हम चाहते हैं, इसलिए हमें अपनी फॉरेन पालिसी का फोकस आपने नेबर्स के ऊपर बनाना पड़ेगा और जो वहां आग लगी हुई है, उसको बुझाने मे हमें हिस्सेदार बनना पड़ेगा, उनके इकोनामिक डेवलेपमेंट में हिस्सेदार बनना पड़ेगा। बंग्लादेश, नेपाल, श्री लंका, पाकिस्तान का इकोनामिक डेवलेपमेंट, म्यांमार और अफगानिस्तान का इकोनामिक डेवलेपमेंट हिन्दुस्तान के इंटरेस्ट में है, इसलिए उनके इकोनामिक

डेवलेपमेंट को अपने इकोनामिक डेवलेपमेंट के साथ जोड़कर, हमें आगे बढ़ना होगा। बहुत शुक्रिया, बहुत धन्यवाद।

شری شاہد صدیقی ''اتر پردیش'' : ڈپٹی چیئرمین سر، میں آپ کا بہت بہت شکر گزار ہوں، جو آپ نے مجھے بولنے کا موقع دیا۔ آج مجھے یہاں فورن پالیسی کے اوپر کچھ بہت ہی اسٹائمنگ تھیمز سننے کو ملی، انٹرنیشنل پاور پلے جس طرح سے ہو رہا ہے، اس کے بارے میں سننے کو ملا۔ میں چاہتا تھا کہ ڈسکشن فورن منسٹری کی ورکنگ کے اوپر ہوتی، اس کی ورکنگ کی گڑبڑی کے بارے میں ہوتی، لیکن یہاں زیادہ تر فارن پالیسی کے اوپر کی بات ہوئی، تو میں بھی اپنے کو روک نہیں پا رہا ہوں کہ فارن پالیسی کے اوپر بات نہ کروں۔

(آپ سبھاپتی ''پروفیسر پی۔جے۔کریین'' صدر نشیں ہوئے)

سر، آج ہندوستان میں ہی نہیں، پوری دنیا میں فورن پالیسی، اکانومک پالیسی کا حصہ بن گئی ہے اور اس لئے فورن پالیسی کی اہمیت بہت زیادہ ہے۔ مجھے لگتا ہے کہ شاید فارن پالیسی کی اہمیت کو سمجھتے ہوئے ہمارے پردھان منتری جی نے اس وقت کوئی فارن منسٹر نہیں رکھا ہے، خود اپنے پاس اس پد کو رکھ لیا ہے تاکہ اس پر زیادہ دھیان دیا جا سکے۔ آج جو فارن منسٹری کا فوکس ہو گیا ہے، وہ بہت میکنکلی ہو گیا ہے، بہت اسپیشلائزڈ بھی ہو گیا ہے، اس کے ساتھ اکانومک بھی جڑ گیا ہے، لیکن کبھی بھی فورن پالیسی کو آپ انٹرنل پالیسی سے نہ الگ کر سکے ہیں اور نہ الگ کر سکیں گے۔ فورن پالیسی رفلیکشن ہوتی ہے انٹرنل پالیسی کی، اس لئے جب اسٹائلائنڈ سیلف انٹرسٹ کی بات کرتے ہیں، ضرور بات کیجئے، کوئی نئی بات نہیں ہے، یہ جو کہا جا رہا ہے کہ آج ہم یہ اسٹائلائنڈ سیلف انٹرسٹ کی بات کر رہے ہیں، آج رئلسٹک پالیسی کی بات کر رہے ہیں، تو پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو بھی ریئلسٹک تھے، پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو بھی اس وقت بائی پالر ورلڈ میں نون ایلائنمنٹ کی بات ریئلزم کے ساتھ جڑی ہوئی تھی۔ اس لئے یہ کہنا کہ ہم رئلسٹک ہو گئے ہیں، اس کے لئے کوئی ریئلسٹک پالیسی نہیں تھی، میں اس بات سے اگری نہیں کرتا ہوں اور اس لئے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمیں اپنے اسٹائلائنڈ سیلف انٹرسٹ کو دیکھتے ہوئے یہ بھی دیکھنا ہوگا کہ ہماری پالیسی پورڈیڈ اپیروچزم میں تو نہیں بدل رہی، کہیں ہم ایلائنڈ سیلف انٹرسٹ کی بات کر کے اپیروچزم کی بات تو نہیں کر رہے ہیں، اس بات کا ہمیں دھیان رکھنا ہوگا۔ مجھے ڈر لگتا ہے کہ ہم بہت ساری چیزیں مورلی جسٹفائی نہیں کر سکتے،

†Translation of Urdu Script

آئیڈیولوجی جسٹیفائی نہیں کر سکتے، ہسٹوریکل جسٹیفائی نہیں کر سکتے، انہیں جسٹیفائی کرنے کے لئے ہم نے ایک فگلیف ڈھونڈ لیا ہے اپنے ننگے پن کو چھپانے کے لئے اور اس کا نام ہم نے رکھ دیا ہے اینلائٹن سیلف انٹرسٹ۔ اس سے ہمیں ہوشیار رہنے کی ضرورت ہے۔

سر، دوسری بات یہ کہی جاتی ہے کہ اینلائٹن سیلف انٹرسٹ جو ہے، صرف ہمارے دیش کے انٹرسٹ میں ہوگا، لیکن میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ دنیا کی ساری جگہ، ساری کنٹریز میں فورن پالیسی انٹرنل پالس اینڈ پریسرز سے انفلوینس ہوتی ہے۔ یونائیٹڈ اسٹیٹس کی پالیسی وہاں کی جوئس لابی انفلوینس کرتی ہے اور وہیں کی ہی نہیں بلکہ مجھے لگتا ہے کہ ہماری فورن پالیسی کو بھی جوئس لابی انفلوینس کرنے کی کوشش کرتی ہے۔ یہی کارن ہے کہ پچھلے دو، تین سالوں میں ہمارے جو فورن منسٹر رہے ہیں، وہ وہاں جا کر جوئس لابی، امریکن جوئس لابی کے سامنے پیش ہوتے رہے ہیں اور اپنی بات رکھتے رہے ہیں۔ اس لئے یہ کہنا کہ ہندوستان کے اندر کیا ہو رہا ہے، ہندوستان میں مائنارٹیز کیا سوچ رہی ہے، ہندوستان میں ڈفرینٹ سیکشنس کیا سوچ رہے ہیں، ہمارے رلیشن عرب کے ساتھ کیا ہیں، اس کا انفلوینس نہیں ہوگا، We will go just by cold-blooded analysis of our self-interest. I do not agree with that.

سر، میں پچوری جی کی اس بات کا بھی سمرتھن کرتے ہوئے یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ امریکہ کے ساتھ ہمارے جو رشتے ہیں، ان سے ہم تلوار کی دھار پر چل رہے ہیں۔ یہ doubled-edged sword ہے اور ہمیں اس تلوار کی دھار پر بہت پھونک پھونک کر قدم رکھنا ہوگا۔ اگر ہم زیادہ کلوز ہوتے ہیں، تب بھی ہمارے کٹنے کا خطرہ ہے اور اگر ہم زیادہ ڈسٹینس رکھتے ہیں، تب بھی ہمیں نقصان پہنچنے کا خطرہ ہے اور اگر ہم زیادہ ڈسٹینس رکھتے ہیں، تب بھی ہمیں نقصان پہنچنے کا خطرہ ہے۔ اس لئے یہ سمجھ لینا کہ امریکہ سے بہت نزدیکی، میں یہ نہیں کہوں گا کہ جو ہماری فارین منسٹری سے ڈیل کر رہے ہیں، وہ ان پٹ فالس کو سمجھتے ہیں، لیکن خاص طور پر ہماری مڈل کلاس کے اندر ایک یہ احساس پیدا ہو رہا ہے کہ امریکہ سے قربت ہمارے نیشنل انٹریسٹ میں ہے۔ میں آپ سے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ امریکہ کے دوست، جو امریکہ کے بہت کلوز ہیں، وہ بھی امریکہ سے اپنا ڈسٹینس بنا رہے ہیں، وہ بھی بش ایڈمنسٹریشن کے بہت زیادہ قریب نہیں آنا چاہ

رہے ہیں۔ جب میں امریکہ کہتا ہوں، what I mean is the Bush Administration. کیونکہ ہم، ہماری پارٹی اور اس پارلیمنٹ ہاؤس میں بیٹھے ہوئے تمام لوگ امریکہ سے دوستی کے پوری طرح سے سمرتھک ہیں۔ امریکن لوگوں کے ساتھ دوستی کے سمرتھک ہیں، امریکن کانسٹی ٹیوشن اور امریکن ہسٹری کے جو پرنسپل ہیں، ان کے ساتھ we are one with them, لیکن اگر ہم وردھ کرتے ہیں تو اس موجودہ ایڈمنسٹریشن کی پالیسیز کا۔ خود امریکہ کے اندر لوگ اس ایڈمنسٹریشن سے دور ہٹنا چاہ رہے ہیں۔ ان حالات میں ہم اگر اپنے کو امریکہ کے بہت زیادہ قریب دکھا کر خوش ہوتے ہیں، تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ بہت سمجھداری کی بات نہیں ہے۔ اس لئے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج امریکن ایڈمنسٹریشن جس لڑائی کی بات کر رہا ہے، ان کی لڑائی کوئی سوویت یونین کے ساتھ نہیں ہے یا کسی ایک دیش کے ساتھ نہیں ہے، آج وہ سویلائی زیشن وار کی بات کر رہے ہیں۔ آج وہاں پر یہ کہا جا رہا ہے کہ پچاس سال تک یہ لڑائی چلے گی اور کچھ انالسٹ ایسے بھی ہیں، جو سویلائی زیشن کے بیچ ہزار سال کی لڑائی کی بات کر رہے ہیں۔ نہیں معلوم کہ دشمن کون ہے، کس سے لڑ رہے ہو، کس پر حملہ کرنا ہے، کہاں لڑنا ہے۔ یہ لڑائی ایک آئیڈیالوجی سے ہے، ایک آئیڈیا سے ہے، ایک کنسیپٹ سے ہے، کیا ہم اس لڑائی میں حصہ دار بننے والے ہیں؟ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ بہت ہی خطرناک کنسیپٹ ہے، بہت ہی خطرناک لڑائی کی بات ہے اور اگر ہم اس لڑائی کا حصہ بنتے ہیں تو ہمیں اس کی بھاری قیمت چکانی پڑ سکتی ہے۔ یہاں پر جب سویلائیزیشنل وار کی بات ہو رہی ہے، میں یہ صاف کر دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندستان کی لڑائی نہ اسلامک فنڈامنٹلزم سے ہے اور نہ ہی سو کالڈ اسلامک ٹیررزم سے ہے۔ ہماری لڑائی ''ٹیررزم'' سے ہے، لیکن اسلامک ٹیررزم، جس کا استعمال پریزیڈنٹ بش بار بار کرتے ہیں اور میں یاد دلانا چاہتا ہوں گا کہ ہندستان آنے سے دو تین دن پہلے ایشیا سوسائٹی کی میٹنگ میں جب پریزیڈنٹ بش نے ٹیررزم کی بات کی اور کئی بار انہوں نے اس ٹیررزم شبد کا پریوگ کیا تو انہوں نے کبھی ٹیررزم نہیں کہا، انہوں کہا کہ India and US are together in the fight against Islamic terrorism. میں منتری جی سے اور سرکار سے کہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ are we together in this fight against 'Islamic terrorism' or 'terrorism'. ہمیں اپنے انٹرنل انٹریسٹ اور انٹرنیشنل انٹریسٹ میں

اس بات کو بہت کلیئر کر کے چلنا پڑیگا۔ اگر ہم اسے کلیئر نہیں کریں گے تو میں آپ کو بتادوں کہ یہ ایک ٹریپ ہے اور اس ٹریپ کے اندر ہم پھنستے چلے جائیں گے اور مجھے لگتا ہے کہ امریکہ خود اپنے لئے ہی اس ٹریپ کو کھود رہا ہے۔ وہ اپنے لئے ایک گڈھا کھود رہا ہے اور اگر الائز بھی آنکھ کھول کر نہیں چلیں گے تو اس گڈھے کے اندر ان بھی کے اور ہمارے بھی گرنے کا خطرہ ہے۔ اس لئے میں سرکار کا دھیان اس بات کی طرف دلانا چاہونگا کہ اپنی فارین پالیسی کو بناتے ہوئے ہم ان باتوں کا بہت دھیان رکھتے ہوئے چلیں۔

پچوری جی نے کہا کہ ہمارا جو فوکس ہے، وہ ملٹی پولر ورلڈ بنانے کا ہے اور میں خاص طور سے منسٹری کا دھیان اس بات کی طرف دلانا چاہونگا کہ ہماری ایکسٹرنل افیئرس منسٹری کی جو فنکشننگ ہے، وہ یوروسینٹرک ہے اور یو ایس سینٹرک ہے۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہے کہ ہمارا فوکس انہیں دیشوں کے اوپر رہتا ہے، اور اس کے بعد جب ہم سیکورٹی کاؤنسل میں آنے کے لئے لڑائی لڑتے ہیں تب ہم کہتے ہیں کہ افریقہ ہمارے ساتھ نہیں آتا۔ جب ہمارا دھیان افریقہ پر ہوتا ہی نہیں تب افریقہ ہمارے ساتھ کیوں آئے گا؟ یہاں پر منسٹر صاحب سے میں یہ کہنا چاہونگا کہ آپ اپنی منسٹری میں بھی اس چیز کو دیکھئے کہ منسٹری کے اندر لوگ افریقہ کی پوسٹنگ ہی نہیں لینا چاہتے ہیں، لیٹن امریکہ کی پوسٹنگ ہی نہیں لینا چاہتے، ان کا فوکس یوروپ اور امریکہ کی پوسٹنگ پر رہتا ہے۔

ہمیں یہ فیصلہ کرنا ہے کہ آنے والے وقت میں اگر ہم ایک ملٹی پولر ورلڈ چاہتے ہیں تو اس ملٹی پولر ورلڈ کو بنانے میں ہمارا کیا رول ہوگا؟ ہمارا کیا فوکس ہوگا؟ ہمارے میمبرس کا کیا رول ہوگا؟ افریقہ، ایشیا اور لیٹن امریکہ کے دیشوں کا کیا رول ہوگا؟ کس طرح سے ہم ان کو اپنے ساتھ لا سکتے ہیں؟ ان کو اپنے ساتھ لانے کے لئے منسٹری اور منسٹرس اپنی پالیسیز میں، اپنے فوکس میں اور اپنے ناریٹیس میں کیا چینج لا رہے ہیں؟

ایک تو ہوتی ہے پالیسی، پالیسی چینج کرتی ہے سچویشن کے حساب سے، لیکن ایک ہوتا ہے لونگ ٹرم گولس، ان لونگ ٹرم گولس کے لئے آپ کو منسٹری کے اندر فوکس بنا کر چلنا پڑتا ہے اور وہاں پر یہ دیکھنا پڑتا ہے کہ آپ کے جو ڈیسک ہیں، افریقہ ڈیسک اور لیٹن امریکہ ڈیسک اور ایشیا ڈیسک اس کے اوپر کتنا دھیان

†Translation of Urdu Script.

ہے اور کتنے دھیان سے ہم کن لوگوں کو یہاں پر رکھ رہے ہیں، ان لوگوں کو ہم کتنی امپورٹنس دے رہے ہیں، کتنی اہمیت دے رہے ہیں، کیا ہم یو ایس اے ڈیسک اور یورپین ڈیسک کو ہی بہت زیادہ اہمیت دیتے ہیں، کیا ہم یو ایس اے ڈیسک اور یروپین ڈیسک کو ہی بہت زیادہ اہمیت دیتے ہیں۔ اس کے لئے ہمیں بہت زیادہ دھیان کرنے کی اور ہوشیار ہونے کی ضرورت ہوگی۔ سر، ہماری جو پالیسی ہے اس کو اس بات پر بھی بہت دھیان کرنا ہوگا کہ جب ہم اکانومک پالیسی کی بات کرتے ہیں، آپ سبھاادھیکش مہودے، میں آپ کی بات کو دوہرا رہا ہوں، آپ نے جو کہا کہ ہمیں یہ دیکھنا پڑیگا کہ ہمارا انٹرسٹ یو ایس اے سے کلوزنیس نہیں ہے یا ہمیں یہ بھی دیکھنا ہے کہ اسرائیل کی طرف ہماری پالیسی کیا ہوگی، ہمیں ویسٹ ایشیا کے اندر، ہم صرف اس سے سیٹس فائی نہیں ہو سکتے کہ ویسٹ ایشیا میں چونکہ کچھ عرب ممالک بھی پرو اسرائیل پالیسی لے رہے ہیں، اس لئے Hindustan will follow them. ہندستان فالو نہیں کر سکتا ان کو، ہندستان کو اپنی فارین پالیسی اپنے طور سے لیکر چلنی ہوگی۔ اسرائیل سے کلوزنیس بھی اسی طرح سے تلوار کی دھار ہے جس طرح سے امریکہ کے ساتھ ہے۔ زیادہ کلوز نظر آئے، کتنا ڈسٹینس رکھا نظر آئے، یہ بڑا امپورٹنٹ ہے، بہت مہتو پورن ہے، اس لئے یہ جو ایک پالیسی بن رہی ہے کیونکہ ہمارے لوگ وہاں کام کر رہے ہیں، ہمارا اکانومک انٹرسٹ، ، ہمارا جاب سکیورٹی کا انٹریسٹ، ہماری انرجی سکیورٹی کا انٹرسٹ ویسٹ ایشیا کے ساتھ جڑا ہوا ہے۔ اس لئے اس دیش میں بہت سے لوگ یہ کہتے نظر آتے ہیں، کہ Indians, Israelis are much closer ideologies. مجھے سمجھ میں نہیں آتا کہ کون سی آئیڈیالوجی، آکیوپیشن کی آئیڈیالوجی، دوسرے کنٹریز پر قبضہ کرنے کی آئیڈیالوجی، ڈیموکریسی کو ختم کرنے کی آئیڈیالوجی، نیوکلیئر بم بنانے کی آئیڈیالوجی اور این پی ٹی کو فلاپ کرنے کی آئیڈیالوجی، یہ اس آئیڈیالوجی پر انڈیا اور اسرائیل کیا کلوز ہیں؟ اگر نہیں ہیں تو ہماری کلوزنیس ویسٹ ایشیا سے تو ہو سکتی ہے، کلچرل ہسٹوریکل، اکانامکل، سوشل اور پولیٹیکل لیکن اسرائیل کے ساتھ نہیں ہو سکتی۔ اس لئے ہمیں اس کلوزنیس کو بناتے وقت ایک تھیوری ابھی جسونت جی چلے گئے بہت سے ان کے دوستوں نے بھی تھیوری دی ہے، بہت سی کتابیں لکھی ہیں۔ اسرائیل ، انڈیا اور یو ایس نیچرل الائنس ہیں میں چاہتا ہوں کہ منسٹر صاحب سے، ای احمد صاحب کا دھیان اپنی طرف

دلانا چاہونگا کہ وہ اس بات کو کلیری فائی کریں، کیا انڈیا، یو ایس اے اور اسرائیل نیچرل الائنس ہیں اگر نہیں ہیں تو کیوں نہیں ہیں، اس کو کلیری فائی کرنے کی ضرورت ہے۔

یہ بات صاف کرنے کی ضرورت ہے۔ سر، آخر میں میں یہ کہنا چاہونگا کہ میں آخری آدمی ہونگا جو یہ مانے کہ اس ملک کی فارین پالیسی ہندستان کے انٹرسٹ کے علاوہ.....مداخلت.....بس اب میں دو منٹ اور بولونگا۔

اُپ سبھاادھکش "پروفیسر پی جے کورین" : جلدی ختم کریں آپ کا گیارہ منٹ کا وقت تھا، ابھی ۱۵ منٹ لئے ہیں اب دو منٹ اور لے لیں۔

شری شاہد صدیقی : آپ کا بہت دھنیواد، بہت شکر گزار کہ آپ نے میرے پر کرپیا کی اور بولنے کے لئے دو منٹ اور دے دئے۔ ورنہ جس طرح کا آج سدن ہے اس وقت بولنے کا کوئی من نہیں کرتا ہے۔ اس لئے بولنا ہوتا ہے کہ کچھ باتیں کہنی ہیں۔ میں ایک بات بہت اسٹرونگلی، بہت من سے کہنا چاہ رہا ہوں۔ مہودے، میں منتری جی کا خاص دھیان آپ کے مادھیم سے چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمیں فارین پالیسی کو نیشنل کنسنسز کی پالیسی بنا کر چلنا ہوگا ہمیں اس میں جو ایک آج پروتی بن رہی ہے اور پالیٹیکل پارٹیز کو ہم کانفڈنس میں نہیں لیتے ہیں، اس طرح سے جس طرح سے لینا چاہئے، اس کے بعد ہم پارٹیز سے شکایت کرتے ہیں، یہ فارین پالیسی آج کے لئے نہیں ہے، ہم آنے والی جنریشن کا فیصلہ کر رہے ہیں۔ چاہے یو ایس اے کے ساتھ ہمارے ریلیشن ہیں چاہے نیوکلیمر ڈیل ہیں۔ چاہے ایران کے اوپر ووٹ ہے اس سے ہماری جنریشن کا فیصلہ ہونے والا ہے۔ اس لئے میں سرکار سے چاہونگا کہ آپ، میں اس بات کے لئے اٹل جی کی تعریف کرتا ہوں کہ اٹل جی نے اس وقت میں بہت سارے معاملات تھے، ساری پارٹیوں کو بلا کر بات کی۔

اس لئے آپ اس پر بات کیجئے اور دوسری بات یہ ہے کہ جو ورودھی ہیں، تو ورودھی آئیڈیولوجکل ہیں، وہ بھی ہندوستان کے سیلف انٹرسٹ میں، اسٹلا کمینڈ سیلف انٹرسٹ میں ورودھ کر رہے ہیں، آپ ان کے ورودھ کے پیچھے موٹیو مت ڈھونڈئے۔ اگر موٹیو ڈھونڈیں گے، تو جو اسٹلا کمینڈ نیشنل کنسینسز بننا چاہئے، وہ نیشنل کنسینسز ایمرج نہیں کرے گا، اس لئے میں درخواست کروں گا کہ کسی ایک کمیونٹی کو، کسی ایک گروپ کو بلا کر آپ بات مت کیجئے ہماری فورن پالیسی کے بارے میں، نہیں تو اس کا فائدہ، ان لوگوں کو ملے گا جو ہندوستان کو نقصان پہنچانا چاہتے ہیں۔ جو ورودھ کر رہے ہیں، آپ ان کو بلا کر بات کیجئے، ان کو بتایئے کہ کیوں ورودھ ہے۔ ہوسکتا ہے کہ آپ کی بات سمجھیں، ہوسکتا ہے کہ آپ کی بات نہ سمجھیں، لیکن کسی الگ الگ کمیونٹی کو، الگ الگ گروپس کو بلا کر بات کرنا بہت ڈینجرس ہے اور اس کے بہت دور تک، بہت نقصان دہ نتائج ہوں گے، اس لئے کسی ایک کمیونٹی سے آپ بات مت کیجئے۔ آخر میں، میں یہ کہوں گا کہ ذرا اپنی فورن پالیسی کو، اپنے نیبر ہڈ کی طرف زیادہ لایئے۔ ہم یہ بات ہر بات، ہر ڈیبیٹ میں کہتے ہیں، لیکن ایسا ہمیں نظر نہیں آتا ہے اور یہ ہو رہا ہے کہ ہمارے چاروں طرف آگ لگی ہوئی ہے۔ آج ہم کہتے ہیں کہ ہم اکانومک سپر پاور بننے والے ہیں، مجھے نہیں لگتا کہ اگر ہمارے پڑوسی، ہمارے ساتھ نہیں ہوں گے۔ ہم اپنے پڑوسیوں کو اکانومکلی ساتھ لے کر نہیں چل سکیں گے، تو ہندوستان بھی آگے نہیں بڑھ پائے گا، ان بیس پر، جس بیس پر ہم چاہتے ہیں، اس لئے ہمیں اپنی فورن پالیسی کا فوکس اپنے نیبرس کے اوپر بنانا پڑے گا اور جو وہاں آگ لگی ہوئی ہے، اس کے بجھانے میں ہمیں حصہ دار بننا پڑے گا، ان کے اکانومک ڈیولپمینٹ میں حصہ دار بننا پڑے گا۔ بنگلہ دیش، نیپال، سری لنکا، پاکستان اکانومک ڈیولپمینٹ، میانمار اور افغانستان کا اکانومک ڈیولپمینٹ ہندوستان کے انٹرسٹ میں ہے ہے، اس لئے ان کے اکانومک ڈیولپمینٹ کو اپنے اکانومک ڈیولپمینٹ کے ساتھ جوڑ کر، ہمیں آگے بڑھنا ہوگا۔ بہت شکریہ، بہت دھنیواد۔

''ختم شد''

श्री राशिद अल्वी (आन्ध्र प्रदेश): सर, इतने इम्पोर्टेंट इश्यु पर हम बात कर रहे हैं, फॉरेन पालिसी पर बात कर रहे हैं और करीब-करीब अपोजिशन तो सारा ही गायब है। बहुत इनसिस्ट कर रहे थे कि फॉरेन पालिसी पर बात होनी चाहिए, लेकिन बहुत तकलीफ के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि सारी अपोजिशन की बैंचिज़ खाली हैं, अपोजिशन का कोई आदमी इस पर बहस करने के लिए मौजूदा नहीं है। इससे इतना तो अंदाजा होता है कि अपोजिशन का देश के लिए और फॉरेन पालिसी के लिए कितना कमिटमेंट है। आज की तमाम बहस के बाद सर, ऐसा लगता है कि फॉरेन पालिसी सिर्फ यूनाइटेड स्टेट और पाकिस्तान तक महदूद रह गई है। इतनी बड़ी दुनिया है और सिर्फ अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान की ही चर्चा फॉरेन पालिसी के अंदर की जाती है।

सर, हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को करीब-करीब 58 साल हो गये और 58 सालों में दुनिया का नक्शा बदल गया है, दुनिया की पालिसीज़ बदल गई हैं, लेकिन आज हमारे मुल्क की फॉरेन पालिसी की बुनियाद वही है, जो 1955 में पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू, उस वक्त के प्रधान मंत्री ने लोक सभा के अन्दर कहा था, जो पंचशील प्रिन्सीपल दिया था, उसमें पांच बातें उन्होंने कही थीं। उन्होंने कहा था, the recongnition by countries of their independence and each other's independence and territorial integrity. दूसरी बात कही थी, non-aggression. तीसरी बात कही थी, non-interference with each other. चौथी बात कही थी, mutual respect an equality और पांचवीं बात कही थी, co-existence. और 1983 मे इसी बात को नॉन एलायनमेंट मूवमेंट के अंदर मिसेज गांधी ने इस तरह कहा था कि we are against exploiation. We are for each other nation's rights to its resources and policies. सर, इसी बात को हमारे देश में यूपीए की सरकार ने आगे बढ़ाने का काम किया है। आज हमारे अपने नेबर्स के साथ-चाहे वह बंग्लादेश हो, चाहे पाकिस्तान हो, चाहे लंका हो-उन सबके साथ पहले से ज्यादा बेहतर रिश्ते हैं। लेकिन आज की फॉरेन पॉलिसी की जो सबसे इम्पोर्टेंट बात है, वह यह है कि देश की जो पांच बड़ी ताकतें हैं, आज हिन्दुस्तान के सबसे ज्यादा अच्छे रिश्ते उन पांचों ताकतों के साथ हैं। वे जो फाइव बिग पॉवर्स हैं, जितने अच्छे रिश्ते हिन्दुस्तान के उन फाइव पॉवार्स के साथ हैं, उतने अच्छे रिश्ते पहले कभी नहीं रहे। आज अमेरिका को लेकर बार-बार यहां चर्चा होती है। सर, मैं अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि अमेरिका के साथ जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, इसका यह बिल्कुल मतलब नहीं है कि अमेरिका की जो सारी पॉलिसीज़ हैं, हम उनका साथ देते हैं। एक दंसलेज ने कहा है कि अमेरिका आज दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी ताकत है और सिर्फ तीन रास्ते हैं, अमेरिका के साथ रिश्ता रखने के लिए। एक रास्ता है कि उसके साथ बवदतिवदज किया जाए, उसके साथ तमेपेज किया जाए और अपने आपको पूरी दुनिया के अंदर पेवसंजम कर दिया जाए। ब्वदतिवदज द तमेपेज जीम ञैण जव हमज पेवसंजमकण दूसरा रास्ता हो सकता है जव make a subordinate ally, और तीसरा रास्ता हो सकता है on the basis of equality. बराबर की बात की जाए और शायद हिन्दुस्तान ने अमेरिका के साथ आज जो एग्रीमेंट किया है, वह बराबर की हैसियत के साथ किया है। पूरी दुनिया ने देखा है कि हिन्दुस्तान जो एग्रीमेंट करना चाहता था- अमेरिका ज्यादा ख्वाहिश रखता था, हिन्दुस्तान के साथ एग्रीमेंट करने की और मैं अपने दोस्तों से कहना चाहूंगा, पाकिस्तान इंसिस्ट कर रहा था, उसी एग्रीमेंट के लिए, जो ऐग्रीमेट हिन्दुस्तान ने

अमेरिका के साथ किया। यहां से जब प्रेज़ीडेंट बुश पाकिस्तान गए तो पाकिस्तान ने कहा कि हम भी वही ऐग्रीमेंट करना चाहते हैं, न्यूक्लीयर डेवलमेंट का–लेकिन अमेरिका ने पाकिस्तान के साथ वह एग्रीमेंट नहीं किया। मैं अपने अपोज़िशन के लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान क्यों इंसिस्ट कर रहा था? लीडर ऑफ दी आपोजिशन ने कहा कि मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि हिन्दुस्तान का फायदा क्या है। पाकिस्तान को क्यों वह फायदा नज़र आ रहा है जो लीडर ऑफ दी अपोजिशन को नजर नहीं आ रहा? पाकिस्तान कह रहा है कि हम वही एग्रीमेंट करेंगे लेकिन हमारे लीडर ऑफ दी अपोजिशन को वह फायदा नजर नही आ रहा। ईरान के साथ हमने वोट दिया है, उसी को लेकर बहुत सारी आपोज़िशन पार्टीज़ इस देश के अंदर शोर मचाने का काम कर रही हैं। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अमेरिका की बाबत 3 मार्च 2003 को उस वक्त के प्रधान मंत्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने कहा था, "I was a supporter of the policy of the Non-Aligned Movement even when I was in the Oppposition. Now, no doubt, the world order is changing an militarily the world is not divided into two groups." यह अटल जी ने कहा- यूपीए के किसी नेता ने, कांग्रेस के किसी नेता ने नहीं कहा, वे देश के प्रधान मंत्री थे-कि आज अमेरिका दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी ताकत है और हम इग्नोर नहीं कर सकते। दुनिया के अंदर दो ताकतें नहीं हैं, अकेला अमेरिका एक ताकत है। सर, जब इराक का मामला आया, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में लिखा था, मैं कोट कर रहा हूं, I quote, "The U.S. amended UN Security Council Resolution 1483 just 48 hours before its passage last week to accommodate a request largely from India." इंडिया की रिक्वेस्ट थी, एनडीए की सरकार अपनी फौज इराक के अंदर भेजने के लिए तैयार थी, उसके लिए युनाइटेड नेशंस के इस रेज़ोल्यूशन के अंदर अमेंडमेंट कराना चाहते थे। केबिनेट कमेटी ने पास कर दिया था, आडवाणी जी यूएसए जाने वाले थे। सर, मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि यूपीए की चेयर परसन श्रीमती सोनिया जी ने 4 जून को लेटर लिखा था कि हम इस बात की मुखालफत करते हैं कि इराक के अंदर फौज नहीं जानी चाहिए। आज वह एन॰डी॰ए॰ कहता है कि यू॰पी॰ए॰ अमेरिका के दबाव में काम कर रहा है। वह एन॰डी॰ए॰ कहता है कि जो मुआहिदा हुआ है, वह अमेरिका के दबाव में हुआ है और उसके जवाब में उस वक्त के Foreign Minister जशवंत सिन्हा जी ने कहा था, no decision had been taken yet on Indian participation in Iraq. लेकिन कांग्रेस ने पूरी ताकत के साथ इस बात की मुखालफ़त की थी कि ईराक के अंदर आर्मी भेजी जाए। सर, उस वक्त यहां तक तय कर लिया गया था कि अगर हिंदुस्तान की आर्मी जाएगी ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this discussion was insisted by the BJP. They wanted that a discussion should be held and they insisted for this even in the last session also. The Government is prepared. The hon. Prime Minister was here and discussion is being held. But, none of the BJP Members is here. Kindly take note of it, Sir. Let the hon. Chair consider it. Is this the way Opposition behaves in this House?

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ): It is very unfortunat Sir.?

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Sir, why should they initiate the discussion?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Why do they want discussion on the issue then?

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir, I am on the 'border of breach of privilege'. I won't say any breach of privilege. Once you insist on a discussion, then, to boycott unofficially is a breach of privilege.

श्री राशिद अल्वी: Business Advisory Committee में कितनी शिद्दत के साथ यह कहा गया कि नहीं, External Affairs पर ही बहस होगी। यह कहा गया कि आप किसी भी मिनिस्ट्री पर बहस कर लें, लेकिन भारतीय जनता पार्टी External Affairs Ministry पर ही बहस करना चाहती है। आप देखिए, कितने लोग बैठे हैं भारतीय जनता पार्टी के! लीडर ऑफ अपोज़िशन अपनी बात कह कर चले गए और आज यहां पर कोई भी नहीं हैं। इससे यह भी पता चलता है कि उनकी सीरियसनेस कितनी है! कितने संजीदा हैं वे foreign policy के लिए!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PPROF. P.J. KURIAN): The Leader of Opposition went after saying that ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): महोदय, जो चर्चा चल रही है, यह सिर्फ इसकी गंभीरता का सवाल नहीं है। सवाल है संसदीय परंपरा और संसदीय मर्यादा का। संसदीय परंपरा और मर्यादा में यह है कि प्रतिपक्ष ने, भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने, उनके नेता ने बहस प्रारंभ की, इनीशिएट किया। बहस की मांग भी की, लेकिन जब चर्चा चल रही है, तो संपूर्ण भारतीय जनता पार्टी, यानी सारा विपक्ष ऐसे लगता है कि बहिर्गमन कर गया है। तो यह परंपरा के लिए, संसदीय मर्यादा के लिए ठीक नहीं है, सवाल यह है। गंभीरता उनकी हो या न हो, यह बात दीगर है, लेकिन संसदीय मर्यादाओं में उनकी आस्था रहनी चाहिए, यह महत्वपूर्ण है और सदन की गरिमा के लिए भी बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है, इसीलिए मेरा निवेदन होगा कि जब तक भारतीय जनता पार्टी न आए, तब तक के लिए इस बहस को बंद किया जाए।

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: No, let me make it clear. The Leader of Opposition went after stating that he had to see the doctor and because of health reasons. That is on record. He has said ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: But, Sir, what about other Members because I need some kind of observation by the hon. Chair.

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Sir, not even a single Member is there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): At least some of the Members should have been present.

The Ministry of State of the Ministry of STATIRTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMTATION(SHRI G.K. VASAN): There should be some observation for it.

श्री मगंनी लाल मंडल: नहीं सर, इस पर आपका नियमन होना चाहिए। नहीं तो बहस बंद होनी चाहिए भारतीय जनता पार्टी के इस व्यवहार के खिलाफ, तब तक जब तक कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोग यहां नहीं आते।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): It is okay. You have

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): It is okay. You have already mentioned it. Now, you please proceed.

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Sir, I request you that instructions should be issued to these people. At least, in future, they should not behave like this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): The Chair cannot direct anybody to be present or not to be present. It is up to them. I can say, it was better if they were present. Okay, please go ahead.

श्री राशिद अल्वी: सर, मैं यह अर्ज़ कर रहा था कि बंगाल के अंदर Kurdish north के अंदर तय हो गया था कि इंडियन आर्मी जाएगी और Kurdish north के अंदर उसको डिप्लॉय किया जाएगा और वजह बताई थी युनाइटेड स्टेट्स ने कि वह इलाका undamaged है और पीसफुल है। इसलिए वहां पर हिंदुस्तानी आर्मी को भेजा जा सकता है। यहां तक एन०डी०ए० की सरकार के अंदर यह बातचीत हो चुकी थी, लेकिन इससे भी ज्यादा गंभीर मसला है कि जब एन०डी०ए० सरकार थी, नेशनल मिसाइल डिफेंस सिस्टम, चीन ने मुखालफ़त कर दी थी, रुस ने मुखालफ़त कर दी थी, दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों ने मुखालफ़त कर दी थी, लेकिन हिंदुस्तान की एन०डी०ए० सरकार ने एन०डी०ए० की हिमायत की थी। हिंदुस्तान इस बात के लिए तैयार था कि मिसाइलों के लिए हिंदुस्तान अपनी जगह दे देगा, कितना बड़ा खतरनाक कदम था। आज वे लोग कहते हैं कि हमने अमेरिका के दबाव में आकर फैसला कर लिया है जो NMD का सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं, जिन्होंने यह फैसला कर लिया था। माननीय जसवन्त सिंह जी का स्टेटमेंट मेरे पास है, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है, it is under consideration, हम इस पर विचार कर रहे हैं। सर, यूनाटेड स्टेट्स की पूरी ग्लोबल एम्पायर बनाने की बात थी। मैं तो उस वक्त को महसूस करके कांप जाता हूं कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर वे मिज़ाइल्स लगा दी जाती। उसकी चाईना और रसिया ने मुखालफ़त की थी। सर, आज लीडर ऑफ अपोजिशन कहते हैं कि हमें इस एग्रीमेंट से क्या फायदा होगा? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो न्यूक्लीयर ग्रुप के 45 कंट्रीज हैं, उनका एटिट्यूड चेंज होगा, हमको यूरेनियम की सप्लाई मिलेगी।

सर, मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि आज पूरी दुनिया के अंदर रसिया, चाईना, फ्रांस, ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका जो फैसला करते हैं, कभी-कभी तो यह अहसास होने लगता है कि जो काम अमेरिका नहीं कर सकता, येचुरी जी सदन में नही हैं, वह रसिया के जरिए करवा देता है। उन मुल्कों के अंदर कितनी करीबी दोस्ती है। ईरान के अंदर जो कुछ हुआ, उसमें वे 27 कंट्रीज हैं, जिन्होंने उसे सपोर्ट करने का काम किया है, उनमें रसिया भी शामिल था, उनमें चाईना भी शामिल था और उनमें दूसरे कंट्रीज भी शामिल थे। अगर हमारा अमेरिका के साथ कोई वायदा हुआ है, एग्रीमेंट हुआ है तो यह इस देश के हित में है और हमारे अपने हित में है। यकीनन हमारा यह कदम न्यूक्लीयर वैपन स्टेट, अगर हमारा देश बनता है तो दुनिया का छठा न्यूक्लीयर वैपन स्टेट बनेगा। इसके लिए पाकिस्तान भी कोशिश कर रहा है। इसीलिए वह अमेरिका से वायदा करवाना चाहता था। अगर हम फैसला

कर रहे हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान के अपने हितों के लिए फैसला कर रहे हैं, किसी दूसरे के हितों के लिए फैसला नहीं कर रहे हैं। हमारे ऊपर जो सैंक्शंस लगी थी, वे सैंक्शंस हटेंगी और हमारा पूरी दुनिया के साथ व्यापार होगा। आज चाईना 100 बिलियन डालर से ज्यादा अमेरिका के साथ बिजनेस कर रहा है, हमारा बिजनेस सिर्फ 20 बिलियन डालर का है। लेकिन उस 20 बिलियन डॉलर में जो बैलेंस है, वह करीब-करीब 1/3 है, 30 परसेंट के करीब है। हमारा यह बिजनेस बढ़ेगा। जो वायदा सिर्फ अमेरिका के साथ हुआ है, वह सिर्फ न्यूक्लीयर डेवलेपमेंट पर नहीं हुआ है, सिर्फ न्यूक्लीयर एनर्जी पर नहीं हुआ है। वह तो साईंस एंड टैक्नॉलोजी पर हुआ है, एग्रीकल्चर पर हुआ है। अगर हमारा मैंगोज़ का एक्सपोर्ट खुल जाएगा तो जो 20 बिलियन का वोल्यूम ऑफ ट्रेड है, यह बढ़कर 30 और 35 तक पहुंच जाएगा। लीडर ऑफ अपोजिशन का यह कहना कि हमें इससे क्या फायदा हुआ है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि लीडर ऑफ अपोजिशन को यह बात समझ में क्यों नहीं आती? सर, 1998 में अकेला फ्रांस था, जब हमने न्यूक्लीयर टैस्ट किया, जिसने हमें सपोर्ट किया था। लेकिन आस्ट्रेलिया ने कहा था कि हम हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं जाएंगे और उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान आने की पाबंदी भी लगा दी थी। आज वही आस्ट्रेलिया है, वहां के प्राइम मिनिस्टर हिन्दुस्तान में आए हैं। इस्से ज्यादा कामयाब हमारी फॉरेन पॉलिसी और क्या हो सकती है? आज दुनिया के जितने मुमालिक हैं, चाहे वे हमारे पड़ोसी देश हों, चाहे दूसरे देश हों, आज हिन्दुस्तान की दोस्ती उन तमाम मुल्कों के साथ है। यहां पर वे सारे लोग हैं नहीं, लेकिन आज पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारा जिस तरीके का रिश्ता है, NDA की सरकार थी, ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Raashid Alvi, you have taken 15 minutes. Please conclude.

श्री राशिद अल्वी: सर, जितना टाइम आप देंगे। ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): How much more time do you want to finish your speech? Two minutes! Please conclude within two minutes.

SHRI RAASHID ALVI: Right, Sir जो आप कहेंगे। NDA की सरकार थी, उनको यही समझ में नहीं आता था कि पाकिस्तान के साथ क्या पॉलिसी बनाई जाए। कभी वह सरकार कहती थी कि जब तक टेररिजम रहेगा, पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी कोई बात नहीं होगी। We will fight to the end; we will fight to finish. कभी कहती थी कि हमारे रिश्ते ठीक हो जाएंगे और हम मेक-अप कर लेंगे। आर्मी को वापस बुला लिया गया और आर्मी सरहदों में 6 महीने तक खड़ी रही। वे यही फैसला नहीं कर पाते थे कि हमें पाकिस्तान के साथ किस तरीके के रिश्ते रखने हैं या किस तरीके के रिश्ते नहीं रखने हैं? लेकिन आज हमारे पाकिस्तान के साथ पहले से बेहतर रिश्ते हैं, और हम positively आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। आजकल मुशर्रफ साहब के जो स्टेटमेंट्स आए हैं, उन्होंने एक तरीके से खुद मान लिया है कि इंडिया, global game के अंदर number one player है, और वे सिर्फ regional player हैं। आज वे उन तमाम terrorist को गिरफ्तार करके जेलों के अंदर बंद कर रहे हैं, उनमें वह terrorist भी शामिल है, जिसे जसवंत सिंह जी, हवाई जहाज में बिठाकर

अफगानिस्तान छोड़कर आए थे, उसको भी उन्होंने जेल में बंद कर दिया है। यह डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह की Foreign Policy का नतीजा है,यह UPA की सरकार की Foreign Policy कर नतीजा है, लेकिन मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि UPA सरकार बार-बार कहती है कि ईरान के मामले में हमने जो वोट देने का काम किया, वह गलत किया। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर हम वोट न भी देते, तब भी उस बात में फर्क नहीं पड़ने वाला था, सिर्फ इतना फर्क पड़ता कि 27 मुल्कों ने वोट दिया, वे 26 रह जाते, लेकिन ईरान के मामले में कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता। यहां मैं यह जरूर quote करना चाहूंगा कि इससे पहले IAEA के अंदर फरवरी, 2003 और अगस्त, 2003 में जो resolutions पास हुए, वे दोनों resolutions मेरे पास हैं, मैं इन्हें पढ़ सकता हूं। NDA की सरकार ने उस समय इनका सपोर्ट किया था, उस वक्त वोटिंग नहीं हुई थी, unanimons फैसला हुआ था। उन resolutions में कहा गया था कि "Iran should have reported these experiments in accordance with its obligation under its Safeguard Agreement." This was the Resolution. NDA ने उस वक्त इनकी हिमायत की थी आज UPA की सरकार ने ऐसा कौन सा काम कर दिया कि सब लोग उसे criticize कर रहे हैं? यह एक बार नहीं हुआ है, फरवरी, 2003 और अगस्त, 2003 में हुआ। तब NDA ने इसे सपोर्ट करने का काम किया था। इसके साथ-साथ मैं अपनी सरकार से यह जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि हमें अपने interests के आधार पर फैसले करने हैं, लेकिन हमें इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि कहीं ईरान, अफगानिस्तान न बन जाए, कहीं ईरान, ईराक न बन जाए। ईराक के अंदर जो कुछ हुआ था, उस वक्त हमने उसकी पूरी मुखालफत की थी। आज यह खतरा यकीनन मंडरा रहा है। येचुरी साहब ठीक कह गए कि अमरीका कोई गलत फैसला न कर ले, हम इसके अंदर हिस्सेदार नहीं बन सकते।

महोदय, मैं अपने प्रधानमंत्री जी को appreciate करता हूं कि उन्होंने Russia के Prime-Minister से बातचीत की और यह कोशिश की कि ईरान का मसला हल हो जाए। मैं उनसे दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि इस बात को आगे बढ़ाने की जरूरत है, ईरान को ईराक नहीं बनने देना है। ईरान हमारा दोस्त रहा है, ईरान ने हमारा साथ दिया है। सवाल सिर्फ दोस्ती का नहीं है, सवाल ईमानदारी और जस्टिस का भी है। यकीनन ईरान की अपनी कमियां हैं, यह मैं जरूर कहूंगा। ईरान, PNT का मेंबर है और उसके बाद जो खबरें उनके यहां से आ रहीं हैं, अगर ईरान, सफाई के साथ United Nation को या IAEA को यह क्लियर करे कि वह Uranium Weapons बनाने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहा है, तो मामला निपट सकता है, लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ इधर भी तवज्जह देनी है कि हमारे पास न्यूक्लियर बम 1974 से है, 1998 में हमने दूसरा किया, फिर तीसरा किया, लेकिन हमने इस तरह behave नहीं किया, जैसे पाकिस्तान ने किया। हमने वह टेकनोलॉजी दुनिया के किसी मुल्क को नहीं दी है, लेकिन न्यूक्लियर बम, ईरान के पास कहां से आया, नार्थ-कोरिया के पास कहां से आया, लीबिया के पास कहां से आया, वह सारा पाकिस्तान ने irresponsible country की हैसियत से behave करने का काम किया। अगर आज हिंदुस्तान आगे बढ़ रहा है,

United States के साथ हमारा कोई agreement हो रहा है, तो वह हमारी responsibility की वजह से हो रहा है, हमारे responsible behaviour की वजह से हो रहा है, क्योंकि हमने irresponsibly behave नहीं किया, इसकी तरफ हमें तवज्जह देनी पड़ेगी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सरकार की तारीफ करता हूं कि जो फॉरेन पालिसी हमारे देश की है, इससे पहले कभी सी नहीं रही। पांचों बड़ी ताकतों के साथ आज हमारे जो रिश्ते हैं, ऐसे रिश्ते पहले कभी नहीं रहे। मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री की Prime-Ministership में देश आगे बढ़ने का काम करेगा और इस Foreign Policy को आगे बढ़ाने का काम करेगा। धन्यवाद।

SHRIMATI N.P. DURGA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I feel it is my privilege and honour to speak on the functioning of the Ministry of External Affairs which plays a pivotal role in our foreign affairs and is in the limelight, particularly during the last couple of years when the issue of Iran came up. A few important Terms of Reference of the Ministry are to contribute its expertise on some aspects of the foreign policy, the actual implementation of the policy, strengthen India's relations with other countries, provide timely information and analysis to the Prime Minister and the concerned Minister about the international developments, apart from looking into other aspects such as Consular, passport & visa services, cultural relations through the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, etc. So, Sir, with your permission, I wish to touch only some of the important aspects relating to the working of the Ministry.

I first come to our foreign policy because it is intertwined with the Ministry's functioning. Sir, India is a country of immense diversity and the same has made its tolerant; perhaps, more ambivalent. We are conditioned in this way of life. Even our foreign policy reflects both ambivalence and tolerance. When we were forced to choose between imperialism and communalism, we chose to remain non-aligned. Similarly, when we had to choose between free market and planned economy, we went in for a mixed economy. It is because we are comfortable with the golden mean i.e., peace.

India, under the leadership of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, along with Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia and G.A. Nazzar of Egypt, is the pioneer of the Non-Aligned Movement. But, are we following the Non-Aligned Movement now with same kind of quest and vigour? I sincerely believe we are not. We are gradually and more rapidly, during the last couple of years, tilting towards imperialism, subsuming our policy with the policies of the superpower of the world. This becomes clear if you look at many recent developments.

Even, in an article, in the World Policy Journal, it was mentioned and I quote, "India did not pursue its policy of Non-Alignment in complete good faith. In practice, New Delhi rarely followed an independent foreign policy. The principal architect of India's foreign policy, Jawaharlal Nehru, was far more prone to criticising the shortcomings of the United States and the Atlantic Alliance." This becomes clear if you look at how India is following the dicatates of the USA on the Iran issue. We are not even uttering a single word against the USA on the Iran issue; instead we are toeing the line of the US, leave alone opposing it. I don't want to touch the Iran Issue since a comprehensive debate has already taken place in this very House. But, I wish to touch upon India's civil nuclear energy cooperation with the USA. I agree that India gained a little bit out of this agreement. But, the game is not over. The Congress has still to carry out the necessary changes in their domestic laws. In spite of that there are some grey areas which I wish to mention here. The first point is, as per the Agreement, Indian civilian nuclear reactors get fuel from other countries. It is welcome. After the production of nuclear power from the fuel that we get from the above countries, you will get Plutonium as a residue. And this very Plutonium is the prime source for our military nuclear facilities. It is understood, since there is no mention about this in the statements made by the Prime Minister, the Plutonium which we will get as a residue should be returned to the countries which have supplied us the fuel. If it is to be returned, how does this Agreement help India to meet Plutonium requirements of our military nuclear facilities because, ultimately, you are not allowed to retain Plutonium for our military nuclear reactors? So, this may be clarified.

The second point is: We are going to put 14 of our civilin nuclear reactors under the IAEA. But, we get no assurance from the USA. The March 7th statement only says that India and the USA will convene a group of countries and pursue such measures as would restore fuel supply to India. So, there is no commitment or assurance from the USA that there will be regular and uninterrupted fuel supply to India.

The third point I wish to make is: India is having more Thorium reserves than any other country in the world. India, I think, has little Plutonium reserves. I would like to know whether the Government can think of getting Plutonium in exchange of Thorium. If yes, the details may be given.

Then, I come to the point of India's security concerns at the regional level and at the global level. I only wish to touch the security aspects at the regional level only. We should view this holistically. I wish to know how

the Ministry is handling this challenge so as to enhance peace, stability and cooperation on India's borders, with the regions and between the regions with which we have increasing interaction. For example, instability in South Asia would definitely impinge on our security.

If there is any problem in the Gulf or the present problem in the Middle East also adversely affects India's security environment, not only in terms of energy supplies but also in terms of the presence of a large India Diaspora in this region, in this backdrop, how is the Government of India moving ahead? We have problems with our neighbours. Let us take Nepal. India continued to be a major trade partner of Nepal. India also signed a Treaty called India-Nepal Treaty of Peace and Friendship in 1950. But, still, we are the victims of Naxalism which has its links with the Maoist groups in Nepal. We have done nothing concrete to suppress this problem. We have problem of extremists using Nepal land to launch activities inimical to India's interest. So far, we have done nothing concrete with the Nepal Government in this regard. I even don't know how the Government of India is looking at the recent coup by King Gyanendra in dethroning the democratically elected Government. I wish the Government to spell out its position out its position on this clearly. We also have problem with Bangladesh illegal migration from Bangladesh is going on and is resulting in ethnic, social and religious tensions in the Indian States bordering Bangaldesh. The rising storm of Islamic militancy in Bangladesh is also a great cause of concern. There is no improvement in spite of having regular meetings at the level of DGs of the BSF and the Bangladesh Rifles, a Joint Working Group and the Home Secretaries. So, I would only say that India and Bangladesh have to have a pragmatic view on these for maintenance of peace and tranquility in this region. The only main problem I see from Sri Lanka is the apprehension of Indian fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. I fail to understand that in spite of having two Agreements in 1974 and 1976, why is it that India and Sri Lanka are not able to solve the problem of fishing rights in the Gulf of Mannar and apprehension of Indian fishermen on the International Maritime Boundary Line? With Chine, of course, we are going on the right path and the main issue with it is the boundary dispute. I hope this would be resolved soon. I do not want to say much on Pakistan. But, I only wish to know what has happened to the expert-level meeting on nuclear confidence building measures and what is the progress of talks on six subjects, i.e., Siachen, Sir Creek, Tulbul Navigation Project, economic and commercial cooperation, terrorism and drug trafficking and promotion of friendly exchanges and the composite dialogue process

started, sometime, in mid 2004. I would also like to know the progress of the proposals which have been added to the CBM basket.

Sir, I wish to make a point on India's quest for a permanent seat in the Security Council. The need to reform the UNSC has also been recognised by the High Level on Threats, Challenges and Change which had submitted its Report in March last year. We had formally presented our candidature for a permannent membership of the UNSC in 1994. If you look at it on any basis or on any objective criteria such as population, size, GDP, economic potential, civilizational legacy, maturity of political system, contribution to the activities of the UN, particularly in peacekeeping operations, we are well qualified to become a permanent member of the Security Council. We have had an agreement with G-4 countries and trying to muster support from a number of other countries. But, no tangible progress is visible on this. I would like to know what the Ministry is doing in this regard.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Pease conclude.

SHRIMATI N.P. DURGA: Sir, this subject is very wide. I have to express my views on that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN(PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Your time was seven minutes. You have already taken nine minutes. There are other speakers also. You come to the concluding paragraph. Please come to the last page.

SHRIMATI N.P. DURGA: I appreciate the proposed move of this Government for reviving its Historical and Research Division which was disbanded in 1993 by the Congress Party itself. There have been demands, for quite sometime, for revival of this. But, I think, now, it is going to be reopened again. This Division is very important because this is the Division which carries out research on the documents and reports of the Ministry and also writes detailed background papers on foreign policy issues. I want that this be revived immediately.

Sir, there is a criticism—of course, it is true—that the External Affairs Ministry, the PMO and his advisors virtually have monopoly on all international affairs, including the areas in which the Ministry has no expertise. The Ministries of Defence, Commerce & Industry, and Finance have a role to play in formulating foreign policy on their subjects. But, the Ministry is not allowing them to play their role which they ought to have been for a better shape in the policy-making. For example, you have removed the Armed Forces from policy-making. The Ministry expressed

its reservations on investment by private companies of India in Bangladesh. You have objected to the Petroleum Ministry's efforts to rope in Bangladesh in connection with a pipeline project from Myanmar. You are not allowing the Indian oil companies to bid for shares in Pakistan's oil companies. These are only some of the examples where the Ministry is standing as an impediment in the prosperity and economic development of the country. So, I suggest that it is better to allow the other concerned Ministries to formulate policy issues of their concern.

So, Sir, these are some of the areas which I thought, I should touch upon, within the time given to me and bring to the notice of the hon. Prime Minister to take appropriate measures for an independent foreign policy. Thank you.

SHRIMATI S. G. INDIRA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, since I have limited time, Mr. Narayanasamy should not interfere when I speak.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: What is this? I am sitting here quietly. Why is she unnecessarily dragging me into it? Well, if it is foreign policy, I will not; but if it is Tamil Nadu, then, I will.

SHRIMATI S. G. INDIRA: Sir, when we are talking about the working of the Ministry of External Affairs, what comes first to our mind is the foreign policy of the Government. As regards the foreign policy, India is at a crucial juncture because from a bipolar world, we have come to an almost unipolar world. So, the Government has to exercise great caution while reshaping the foreign policy.

Now, we are talking about the UPA Government's action about the Indo-US nuclear accord. This is being hailed as something great and in the interest of India. We forget that it is only a paper now. Unless ratified by the Congress, certain restrictions already imposed will not be removed. Even if the agreement gets through, what do we stand to gain and what do we stand to loose? This is to be analysed in detail.

The importance of signing the nuclear deal with India was activated by President Bush when he was in his aircraft to India, and he started the operation in this regard. When he landed in New Delhi, he had said that he wanted that deal to be signed during his visit itself. Then only, we started our operation to propose the draft by conducting interaction with nuclear experts, and finally the agreement was signed. Here, the question arises whether we are doing it under the direction of America. When President Bush had landed in India, in reply to a question on the issue, he had said

that he wanted the agreement to be signed during this visit. And, we had obliged him by doing it. The question arises here, why our mission in Washington failed to understand the American mood?

Traditionally, we have been following the policy of non-alignment and this has certainly raised the prestige of India in the international area. We are in the unipolar world now and that calls for great care in dealing with great powers like the US. We have a time-tested friend, Russia, which stood through India in times of need. But the Agreement with the US should not be seen in isolation. There are other aspects like agricultural sector where we should be very careful. There has been a pressure in the past on the reduction of agricultural subsidies and also free power for irrigation purposes. It is also a fact that farming in the US is heavily subsidised in spite of advanced technology used there.

In the past, there has been pressure on India on the question of reduction of agricultural subsidies, and also free power given to farmers for the purposes of irrigation. It is also a fact that farming has increased in the US, and the United States is giving various types of subsidies to its farmers. So, this issue should also be considered. We should not always oblige the United States. I feel it is my duty to caution the Government about our policy towards other countries. This Nuclear Agreement with the United States should not affect our relationship with other countries because the United States has certain reservations about Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Zimbabwe, Myanmar and Belarus. So, my caution of word to the Government is that our signing of this Nuclear Agreement with the United States should not affect our relationship with these countries. On the other hand, our relationship with various countries should be determined by our own policy and our national interest. Now, His Excellency had gone to Myanmar in order to have good relationship with that country. He had a successful visit to Myanmar. But, America has its own reservations about Myanmar.

Sir, the issue of terrorism should not be seen in isolation. The United States wants India to have enmity with those countries with which it has enmity. Although the United States has been speaking about cross-border terrorism for a long time, but it has not come forward to take any serious action against Pakistan from where the terrorists are being trained and sent to our country for creating so many problems. Those terrorists are carrying out attacks in our country. So, we should adopt a cautious approach in this regard. We should be careful in having relationship with the US.

3.00 P.M.

Sir, the other point which I want to raise is this. There are some States which are having special interest in signing agreements with the foreign countries. We are having some agreements with foreign countries. For example, the policy of the Union Government towards Sri Lanka, Malaysia and Singapore is of great relevance to Tamil Nadu because a lot of people from Tamil Nadu are going to these countries to earn their livelihood. Sometimes, they are cheated, and then, they wander here and there, and they immediately come back to India. So, here, I want to stress the point that whenever the Foreign Policy is reshaped, even in a minor way, it is important to ascertain the views of all the political parties and also the views of all the Chief Ministers. Such a step will avoid unnecessary controversy which was witnessed during the recent visit of President Bush. During the visit of the US President, there were so many protests at various places in the country. It created an ugly situation. So, in order to avoid recurrence of such a situation, all the Chief Ministers should be consulted before start of such a visit. In his recent visit to India, the Prime Minister of Australia went to the IIT, Chennai. So, everyone wants to have some special interest in some States. So, in order to have good relations with the foreign countries, the Government should call meeting of the Chief Ministers whenever some foreign head of State comes to India.

Sir, my next point is about the problem being faced by the Indians working abroad. The Indian citizens working in foreign countries, particularly in the Gulf, Malaysia and Singapore are facing a lot of problems. They are promised that they would get very good job and salary there. But, when they reach there, they do not find any job. They feel cheated and return back to India. I would like that the Indian Embassies in all those countries should have a register and they should maintain this register which should have the number of labourers going from India as also their condition over there. They should also keep in touch with those labourers and should take care of them. To put an end to such problems, the Centre should write to the Indian Embassies to maintain such a register.

Now, we have a full-fledged Overseas Indian Affairs Ministry and it is reported that the meeting of all State Ministers would cover discussion on their problems also. This step would be helpful in understanding the problems of Indian migrants and Indian workers who go out from India.

The problem of innocent Indians lodged in foreign jails is yet another issue. All the way, we are reading in newspapers and viewing in TV channels about their problems. Recently, one such case came up. One Sorabjit

Singh, from Punjab, is shown as having lodged in Pakistan jail for a long time. But it has also been reported in so many newspapers that our Ministry has not taken any steps for his release. Even his wife had petitioned before our Chairman that our Government was not taking any steps to save her husband. These are the things to be taken care of.

There is one important thing and that is about Kachhativu. In Tamil Nadu, we are having a problem about this. In 1984, an agreement was made with Sri Lanka and at that time, in Tamil Nadu, the DMK party was in power. They have not taken any steps. Our fishermen are now facing so many problems. When they are within the territorial limits of our country, the army of Sri Lanka attacks them even though we are having the full rights upon our territory. In the time of agreement, it has been mentioned that during the festival of Saint Antony Church, the Indian fishermen also can take part in that festival. But, after Kachhativu has been given to Sri Lanka, our fishermen are denied entry and they are not able to enjoy that festival. So, there are long-pending problems. Every time, our Chief Minister writes letter to the Government of India about our fishermen held up in Sri Lanka and for their release. Every month, rather every day, we are facing such situations. Action should be taken in this regard to save the fishermen of Tamil Nadu.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय नेता विरोधी पक्ष यहां नहीं हैं। एक समय था जब भारतीय जनता पार्टी के पूरे सदस्य यहां से चले गए थे। अभी अहलुवालिया साहब यहां आए हैं। आपकी उपस्थिति दर्ज हो गई है।

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया (झारखंड): मैं जरा इसमें संशोधन कर देना चाहता हूं ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: मेरा समय नहीं कटेगा इसमें।

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: नहीं, आपका समय नहीं काटूंगा। मैं संशोधन कर देना चाहता हूं कि नेता प्रतिपक्ष की तबियत खराब थी, उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री जी को लिख कर दिया था कि मैं बोलने के बाद चला जाऊंगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): I have already explained it.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, let me set the record straight.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: मैं दूसरी बात कह रहा हूं।...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: और मांग हम ही ने की थी, चर्चा हम चाहते थे। दुर्भाग्य से यह एक ऐसे दिन लगा है फगुवा खेलने आपको भी जाना है और फगुवा खेलने हमारे आदमी को भी जाना है और राज्य सभा के आपके लोगों का टिकट डिक्लेयर नहीं हुआ, हमारे सब डिक्लेयर्ड हो गए।.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: हमको खुशी है कि आपको मिल गया।

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: नॉमिनेशन भरने गए हुए हैं। इसलिए यहां सांसद कम हैं। मैं भी चला गया था, मैं रात दो बजे वापिस आया हूं, मैं पेपर तैयार करने गया था। टेलीफोन गया कि हाउस में * हो रहा है। राशिद अल्वी जी का भाषण सुनने के लिए हमको बैठना जरूरी था, मेरा दुर्भाग्य है कि मैं उनका भाषण नहीं सुन सका। वे विशेषज्ञ हैं विदेश मंत्रालय के। उनका भाषण मेरे को जरूर सुनना चाहिए था।...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: जसवन्त जी ने जब अपना भाषण आरम्भ किया था तो उन्होंने आर॰जे॰डी॰ की चर्चा की थी। संयोग ऐसा था कि हम लोगों ने वह बात सुनी नहीं कि आर॰जे॰डी॰ के बारे में उन्होंने क्या टिप्पणी की। लेकिन मैं यह मानकर चलता हूं कि उन्होंने अच्छी टिप्पणी नहीं की होगी। क्योंकि राष्ट्रीय जनता दल के बारे में और हमारे नेता के बारे में ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक (गोवा): आरजेडी को विदेश नीति आती नहीं, समझ भी नहीं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: मैं जानता हूं कि उनकी पार्टी का हमारे नेता माननीय लालू प्रसाद और राष्ट्रीय जनता दल के बारे में क्या ख्याल है? लेकिन उन्होंने कहा कि राष्ट्रीय जनता दल को वैदेशिक नीति के बारे में कोई ज्ञान नहीं है। मैं मानकर चलता हूं कि उनके मन में जो पूर्वाग्रह है राष्ट्रीय जनता दल के बारे में, उसी के आलोक में उन्होंने यह टिप्पणी की थी। सारे लोग जानते हैं, मैंने उनका भाषण बड़े गौर से सुना है, लेकिन एक दिन ऐसा भी आया, जब आपकी सरकार थी, तो राष्ट्र में * का माहौल था और *का यह माहौल था कि जसवन्त बाबू उस समय विदेश मंत्री थे और डा॰ मनमोहन सिंह ने अमेरिका के साथ अभी जो समझौता किया है और समझौते का जो सुखद परिणाम आया है, उस परिणाम के आलोक में मुशर्रफ साहब ने आतंकवादी सलाउद्दीन को बंद किया है और यह सलाउद्दीन वही आतंकवादी है जिसके खिलाफ हवाई जहाज के अपहरण करने का मुकदमा था और काश्मीर की जेल में वह बंद था और जसवन्त बाबू उस अपराधी को जेल से निकालकर ले गये थे कंधार में छोड़ने के लिए। हमारे लिए यह सबसे बड़ा राष्ट्रीय* का सवाल था। ...(**व्यवधान**)... तो राष्ट्रीय जनता दल को वैदेशिक नीति के बारे में कोई ज्ञान नहीं है, अगर ऐसी आप बात कहते हैं, तो इस बात को समझते हैं कि आपको अल्पज्ञान है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please take your seat.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

...(*Interruptions*)... Please sit down (*Interruptions*)... Please take your seat.

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि राष्ट्रीय जनता दल ...(**व्यवधान**)...

तब क्यों नहीं सलाउद्दीन गिरफ्तार हुआ? ...(**व्यवधान**)... तब क्यों नहीं गिरफ्तार हुआ। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आज मुशर्रफ की तारीफ हिन्दुस्तान के सदन में करते हुए * नहीं आ रही है। ...(**व्यवधान**)... * नहीं आ रही है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी०जे० कुरियन): अहलुवालिया जी, प्लीज ...(**व्यवधान**)...

नो, नो, प्लीज, प्लीज ...(**व्यवधान**)...

डा० कुमकुम राय: (बिहार): लेकिन यह तो सच्चाई है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: आप सदन में उनकी तारीफ कर रहे हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी०जे० कुरियन): प्लीज, प्लीज। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

डा० कुमकुम राय: आपके नेता आतंकवादी को जहाज में लेकर कंधार गये थे। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

सारे आतंकवादियों को लेकर जहाज में गये थे। ...(**व्यवधान**)...उनको कंधार में छोड़ दिया। ..(**व्यवधान**)..यह सच्चाई है। इससे आप मुह मोड़ेंगे क्या? ...(**व्यवधान**)... विदेश नीति देख ली है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: महोदय, ...(**व्यवधान**)... माननीय अहलुवालिया साहब ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Please take your seat. (*Interruptions*)... Please sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please take your seat.

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी (बिहार): सच्चाई कड़वी होती है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी०जे० कुरियन): नो, नो प्लीज ...(**व्यवधान**)...भंडारी जी, आप बैठ जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप बैठ जाइए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... आप सीनियर मेम्बर हैं, आप बैठ जाइये। ...(**व्यवधान**)... मंडल जी प्लीज ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: जम्मू-कश्मीर के मुख्य मंत्री ने अपनी बेटी को छुड़वाने के लिए आतंकवादियों को छोड़ा ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Ahluwalia, you do not listen to the Chair.

...(**व्यवधान**)... प्लीज। अहलुवालिया जी। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: कभी कटिहार, पूर्णिया में जाकर बोलिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

डा॰ कुमकुम राय: सर, जवाब तो देना ही है, उन्होंने राष्ट्रीय जनता दल का नाम लिया है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री एस॰एस॰ अहलुवालिया: आपकी कृपा से नहीं आते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Mr. Ahluwalia, you do not do like this. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please take you seat.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: यहां कोई किसी की कृपा से नहीं आता है। आप भी अपनी पार्टी की कृपा से आए हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)... अहलुवालिया जी भी अपनी पार्टी की कृपा से आते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो॰ पी॰जे॰ कुरियन): मंडल जी, आप बडे सीनियर मैम्बर हैं। आप सब्जेक्ट के बारे में बात कीजिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... No, no. आप बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... Please do not bring in personal matters here. ...(*Interruptions*)...

प्रो॰ राम देव भंडारी: ऐसा कहना शोभा नहीं देता है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): नो, नो। आप बैठ जाइए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... What is the Leader of the Opposition said was only a political point. He did not make any personal remark. ...(*Interruptions*)... I was listening that ...(*Interruptions*)...It was a political point. You can answer it politically --(*Interruptions*)... Do not mention names. ...(*Interruptions*)... Do not mention names. ...(*Interruptions*)... That is not correct. ...(*Interruptions*)... You stick to the subject ...(*Interruptions*)... Okay. ...(*Interruptions*)...

Mr. Ahluwalia, you have to address the Chair. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Mandal, please address the Chair.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: मैं तो शालीनता और मर्यादा में विश्वास रखने वाला व्यक्ति हूं। चूंकि मेरी पार्टी की चर्चा हुई थी और मान्यवर नेता विरोधी पक्ष ने की थी। उस आलोक में, मैंने अपनी बातें कही हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): It was only a political point. It was nothing personal. ...(*Interruptions*)... One second. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: मैंने कोई आरोप नहीं लगाया और न मैं कोई आरोप लगाने वाला हूं।

...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Let me make it clear that I listened that speech. ...(*Interruptions*)... It was a political point. ...(*Interruptions*)... It was a political point.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: महोदय, जब कोई मेरी पार्टी के बारे में, मेरे नेता के बारे में टिप्पणी करेगा तो मैं उसका प्रतिकार करूंगा हालांकि मैंने प्रतिकार नहीं किया है, सिर्फ याद दिलाया है। मेरी पार्टी के बारे में इन्होंने कह दिया और उनके नेता ने कह दिया कि वैदेशिक नीति के बारे में उनको ज्ञान नहीं है, तो इनसे नजरिया लेकर, ज्ञान लेकर हमारी पार्टी नहीं चलेगी। इसीलिए मैंने उनको कहा था, हमारा अपना नजरिया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो॰ पी॰जे॰ कुरियन): ठीक है। अब आप प्रोसीड करिए। Please Go ahead.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: महोदय, कई सारे लोगों ने चर्चा की है, इसलिए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो॰ पी॰जे॰ कुरियन): आपके सात मिनट खत्म हो गए हैं लेकिन आप पांच मिनट में खत्म कीजिए।

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: अहलुवालिया जी कभी कभी तैश में आ जाते हैं, हमारे बिहार से आए हैं ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो॰ पी॰जे॰ कुरियन): अब सब्जैक्ट पर बात कीजिए। आपका टाइम सात मिनट था जो अब खत्म हो चुका है, लेकिन पांच मिनट और ले लीजिए और खत्म करिए।

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: महोदय, मैं यही बात कह रहा था कि दो बार विदेश नीति पर इस सदन में चर्चा हुई है, एक बार ईरान के मामले पर और दूसरी बार जब अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति यहां आए और भारत की सहमति का बयान अखबार में आया - प्रधान मंत्री का और राष्ट्रपति का - तब उस आलोक में, दो बार चर्चा हुई है। जिन बिन्दुओं पर चर्चा हुई है, उन बिन्दुओं पर मैं अपनी बात नहीं कहना चाहूंगा। जब श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री थे, तब उन्होंने वैदेशिक नीति की आधारशिला रखी थी। उस वैदेशिक नीति की आधारशिला में पंचशील का सिद्धांत था और शांतिपूर्ण सहअस्तित्व का सिद्धांत था - यही दो मर्म थे। लेकिन किसी भी राष्ट्र की वैदेशिक नीति कल्पना पर नहीं चल सकती और न ही आदर्श पर चल सकती है। आदर्श एक सिद्धांत होता है आदर्श एक नीति होती है, लेकिन जो व्यावहारिक पक्ष है उसका व्यावहारिक पक्ष होता है। यह जो गुटनिरपेक्षता के आधार पर पंचशील का हमारा सिद्धांत था, वह हमारा आदर्श जरूर था, वह आदर्श आज भी है लेकिन उस आदर्श की पृष्ठभूमि में परिस्थिति थी, हमारा वह आदर्श परिस्थितिजन्य था, वह यथार्थ था कि उस समय में दो ध्रुवीय दुनिया थी। उस दो ध्रुवीय दुनिया में हमें कहीं न कहीं, तीसरी दुनिया को, जो थर्ड वर्ल्ड के नेशंस थे, उनको संगठित करना था और एक पक्ष का सहयोग लेना था-यही यथार्थ था।

यहां चर्चा हुई कि हमें बहुपक्षीय, मल्टीपोलर सिस्टम में अपने राष्ट्र को डेवलप करना चाहिए। इसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं। अमेरिका हर मामले में एक शक्तिशाली देश है, यह बात सही है। लेकिन अमेरिका के सामने हमारा समर्पण हो रहा है, किसी भी समझौते के तहत या किसी भी कार्यवाही के तहत यह बात सही नहीं है। हमारा राष्ट्रहित सर्वोपरि है, हमारी सार्वभौमिकता है, हमारी सीमा की सुरक्षा सर्वोपरि है और जो वैदेशिक नीति का हमारा आधार है, बुनियाद है, वह इसी सिद्धांत के आधार पर है।

महोदय, इन सारी चीजों के बाद एक बात और है कि विश्व में शांति हो और विश्व में लोकतंत्र कायम हो - हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की यह प्रतिबद्धता रही है। लेकिन जो पड़ोसी मुल्क है, जिसकी चर्चा जसवन्त बाबू ने भी की है, पॉवरफुल नेबर्स और पॉवरफुल नेशंस, ये जो दुनिया के दो सिद्धांत रखे हैं, हमारे जो पड़ोसी राष्ट्र हैं, सार्क की कंट्रीज़ हैं - नेपाल की चर्चा जसवन्त बाबू ने नहीं की, यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है। लेकिन येचुरी साहब ने नेपाल की चर्चा की है - वैदेशिक नीति के मामले में आतंकवाद हमारे लिए सबसे बड़ा मुद्दा है। हमारी सार्वभौमिकता के साथ, राष्ट्रीय हित के साथ, इकनॉमिक सिक्योरिटी के साथ जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद है और जो कश्मीर का ईश्यू है, यह भी हमारा सबसे बड़ा सवाल है। नेपाल में राजा वीरेन्द्र की हत्या हो गयी। राजा वीरेन्द्र की इसलिए हत्या हुई कि उनकी चेष्टा थी कि देश में लोकतांत्रिक संस्था मजबूत हो। नेपाल उसी ओर बढ़ रहा था और एक तरह से हर चीज़ को उन्होंने, जो democratisation में होता है - लोकतांत्रिक आधारशिला रखा जाना - राजा वीरेन्द्र वैसा ही प्रयास कर रहे थे। राजा वीरेन्द्र की हत्या हुई। भारत सरकार ने उनको सुरक्षा नहीं दी। लोकतंत्र हमारे पड़ोसी मुल्क में कायम हो - अभी जो समझौता हुआ और जो आतंकवादियों की गिरफ्तारी पाकिस्तान में हो रही है - एक और सफलता भारत को मिली कि जो संयुक्त बयान आया, उसके बाद बुश साहब पाकिस्तान गए और मुशर्रफ साहब को कहा कि पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र बहाल करो, वहां लोकतंत्र लाओ। पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र लाओ, ऐसा बुश साहब ने कहा। जो समझौता हुआ, उसे मैंने वेबसाइट पर देखा, इंटरनेट पर, कि काठमांडु में बहुत सारे बयान आए। नेपाल के कई राजनीतिक दलों के नेताओं ने बयान दिया कि बुश साहब का और हमारे प्रधानमंत्री का जो संयुक्त बयान आया कि नेपाल में परिस्थिति बदलेगी और नेपाल में परिस्थिति बदलेगी, तो लोकतंत्र की पुन: वापसी होगी, लेकिन नेपाल की जो स्थिति है, उसमें लोकतंत्र की वापसी की कोई संभावना नहीं दिखाई दे रही है और ऐसा लगता है कि भारत सरकार की जो अपनी वैदेशिक नीति है और अपना प्रभाव है, अपना प्रयास है, इस फ्रंट पर, इस रास्ते पर, कहीं प्रभावकारी तरीके से इसका इस्तेमाल होना चाहिए, जो नहीं हो रहा है। इसीलिए जब राजा वीरेन्द्र की हत्या हुई थी, तो यह बात आई थी कि जो आतंकवादी हैं, जो पाकिस्तान से नेपाल के मार्ग से कश्मीर में जाना चाहते हैं, उनका नेपाल जाने का रास्ता बंद हो रहा था और राजा वीरेन्द्र ने उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही प्रारंभ कर दी थी, तो लोगों ने कहा कि पाकिस्तान का हाथ है, कई लोगों ने कहा कि अमेरिका का हाथ है, कई लोगों ने कहा कि चीन का हाथ है, लेकिन जिसका भी हाथ था, हमारे पड़ोसी मुल्क नेपाल में लोकतंत्र की हत्या हो गई, लोकतंत्र की पुन: वापसी हो, इसलिए मैं इस मौके पर भारत सरकार से मांग करना चाहूंगा कि इस मामले में कहीं न कहीं प्रभावकारी कदम उठा लेने चाहिए। इन्हीं बातों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

DR. CHANDAN MITRA (Nominated): Thank you very much, Sir.

A lot of points have already been made. So, I do not want to go over all of them. I would like to approach this debate from two aspects. The first one is the larger issue, the macro situtation, which we have to taken into account. The larger point where I would like to raise a critical reference is the seeming absence of transparency in the dealings of Foreign Policy. Right from the beginning, in India, there has been a great tradition of consensus on Foreign Policy issues. From the time of our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, right down to even now, there is a consensus and despite internal differences, despite the fact that successive political parties have come to power, there is a certain continuity on Foreign Policy issues that has been maintained in this country. This continuity has been maintained because the successive Governments have been transparent about the Foreign Policy. There have been open and frank discussions on the Foreign Policy and, on the basis of contributions made by all political parties as well as thinkers and experts, certain consensus has evolved. I am not suggesting that there has been a complete deviation from transparency. But, there are slightly worrying things that have happened in the recent past that lead us to be concerned about whether this consensus is breaking down as a result of this lack of transparency. The Indo-US Nuclear Deal is one such instance. You shall recall, Sir, in this House, many demands have been made, from time to time, that the Government should come upfront and discuss all the aspects of our Foreign Policy, particularly what is happening on the Indo-US front. We have been getting only official statements. Many things are being reported in the media. But, these are not being fully clarified. The House has not been fully taken into confidence. All-Party meetings have not been called and the kind of continuity and transparency we should have seen in Foreign Policy has not been happening. And, this, I think, is a matter of some concern to which I would seek the Government's attention to try and redress that. I feel, while welcoming what has been achieved in our relations with the USA, which are better than ever before, there is, again, a continuity in this policy. I think, an adequate cost-benefit analysis of our Nuclear Deal with the USA has not been fully done as yet. I think, it was the responsibility of the Government to take the political parties into confidence, the House into confidence and be upfront on a certain number of issues. What have we lost and what have we gained? Very clearly, it is apparent that our claim to a Permanent Seat in the UN Security Council is now out of question.

This has been clearly and categorically rejected by the United State, which by exercising its authority as a sole Super Power in the world today, has ruled this out. On the floor of the House, I do recall statements by the Prime Minister and the then External Affairs Minister, where this point was made that India was very serious and seriously pursing for the United Nations Security Council's permanent seat. The then External Affairs Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh had categorically said, "We will not accept any status other than full veto power membership in the United Nations Security Council." What happened to that? I would like to ask the Government, what is the status? Is this something that we have given up in the give and take of the nuclear deal? Is it something that we have abandoned the pursuit? That should be clarified. But, I am afraid, this has never been clarified. Statements are coming from Washington. But we don't know how the Government is proposing to pursue this matter.

Sir, another macro observation I would like to make is that, time and again, it appears that we are doing things quietly and furtively. Instead of being assertive and categorical about our Foreign Policy issues, which some other countries, like, Russia and China, which are also, now a days, to a great extent, browbeaten by the United States. But they have been able to follow an independent Foreign Policy and make their position absolutely clear. But, as this was pointed out during the IAEA vote issue, was India hoping that it does not come to a vote? Why should that be? We should be clear-cut and categorical in our policy as we have always been. But this is for the first time when I find a certain opposition where we are trying to avoid taking a decision and being categorical about our Foreign Policy. It could be the pressure of the internal politics. But, I believe that this kind of furtiveness in Foreign Policy matters lowers the status and dignity of a country. (Time-bell) If we are the fourth largest economy of the world, we have to behave like the fourth-largest country. The power in the world today is not just military power, economic power is also there. And, there is no doubt that India is a major economic power. I will take just two more minutes to conclude, Sir, it should be commensurate with our economic strength. But we don't see evidence of that. We seem to believe in doing things quietly and behind peoples' back. I think, it is not proper. And, I would urge the Government to be upfront about this issue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): Conclude please.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, just one more minute. The issue of Nepal was just mentioned, and it was mentioned earlier also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIAN): Don't repeat.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: I think, again, there is a lack of clarity on this, which the Government has to clarify and be clear. It is very regrettable that some outlaws of Nepal, those who believe in an armend revolution and are trying to overthrow the Government of Nepal are fleeting in and out of India, and are being hosted by the Government. They are coming to India and, with the Government of India, informally trying to broker some arrangement. Given the kind of situation in the country, the internal security sets and naxatite problem, any hobnobbing with the Maoists of Nepal, I think, is a very, very dangerous policy, and, on this, the Government needs to come absolutely clear.

Then, I would like to say that the Bangladesh Prime Minister, Mrs. Khaleda Zia, is coming to Delhi shortly. Bangladesh has become an even more serious problem than Pakistan. I would like to know from the Government what the Government is going to do on the issue of Bangladesh. How are we going to contain? Are we going to be dependent on FBI and the United State's authorities to tell Bangladesh what to do? It is our neighbour, and with the terrorist camps multiplying there, what policy we propose to take on the issue of terrorism in Bangladesh.

Finally, Sir, it is most regrettable that the excellent diplomatic and military relations we established with Israel, seem to have given up completely. Israel is the second-largest supplier of defence equipments to India, today. And, the excellent arrangement and policy had been struck by the previous Government. And, starting with Mr. Narsimha Rao's Government, which accorded diplomatic status to Israel and diplomatic relations were established. But over the last few years, last two years in particular, we have systematically downgraded our relationship with Israel, and we did not even send a message of congratulations when Israel pulled back from the West Bank. Sir, I would urge that these are matters that need to be rectified, and urge the Government to look into all this, and devise a proper upfront policy befitting India's status as an aspiring Big Power.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Is he replying or intervening?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I an only intervening. The Prime Minister will reply. ...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): He is intervening. (*Interruptions*). He is not replying. There are other speakers.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Till what time it will go on?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIAN): As the House decides. I am not going to decide it. The House is the supreme authority. Mr. Ahluwalia, if you want to close it, it is up to you. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Anand Sharma.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Reply will be by the Prime Minister. You have heard it clearly. I am merely intervening with the permission of the Chair. Sir, the House is discussing the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs and the functioning of the Ministry. To begin with, I would like to say that the conduct of India's foreign policy has been consistent with our stated goals as a nation state. This policy, which has always had the backing of a broad national consensus, has kept India's sovereign interest uppermost in its mind. The policy is not only independent as far as decision-making is concerned, but it takes into consideration the regional and the global situation.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, during the course of this debate, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and my esteemed friend, Shri Sitaram Yechury, had raised certain points, so did Mr. Shahid Siddiqui and some other hon. Members, including Dr. Chandan Mitra. Sir, there was reference to what is our policy with regard to India's neighbours, the Indo-U.S. relations, the understanding which has been reached with United States of America and also whether there is any departure or deviation from the policy which has been pursued by India, consistently since its independence.

Sir, as far as India's relation with her neighbours are concerned, it has been India's endeavour to ensure that there is a better understanding. We had the SAARC Summit for which the Prime Minister had gone to Dhaka. India's efforts are to ensure that this region becomes a region of peace and development. India being a major country of this region plays a pro-active role, a constructive role in ensuring that South Asia; this region as such can progress. All countries of this region not only India, but Pakistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan and Sri Lanka all have similar problems when it comes to alleviation of poverty, when it comes to development. And if this region becomes a region of peace where there is a free movement of people, there is free trade and understanding, then, it will be not only in the interest of our region but of the world.

Sir, I will not go into the specific details except to make two references one to Bangladesh which is there in the Report and which Mr. Yechury had raised. Yes, it is a shared national concern when there is a spurt of violent extremism, which has linkages with other countries which have been responsible for nurturing and promoting cross border terrorism. Sir, new sources, new bases emerge, that is our concern. It would not be correct to assume that the Government of India is oblivious to this threat. It has been mentioned in the Report. It has been discussed in the various committee meetings. It has been raised in this House, if I recall correctly, where certain questions had come up. And, the Government has stated very clearly that we have not only conveyed our concerns, but whatever measures can be taken by the authorities, which need not be detailed, are being taken in this regard. Nepal is another area. The developments in Nepal, the intervention by the King and suspension of the Government, Parliament, democracy, these are the internal dynamics of that country, but those have been engaging India's attention and matters of, again, concern to us. It has been our endeavour, by meaningfully engaging all sides concerned, to ensure that the democratic process is restored. We are clear in this regard that there is no other solution. We talk of restoration of normalcy, that the political processes begin, political parties are involved so that the territory, the space, which should belong in any democracy to the political parties, is not taken away by forces or elements who do not believe in that. Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had talked about our relations with Pakistan. There was a suggestion that we should stop referring to Pakistan or Pakistan-sponsored violence or terrorism, especially, when we talk to the United States of America. He felt that that would be contrary to India's growing profile, and, when we talk of this issue, it is a betrayal of lack of strength or lack of self- confidence. Sir, I am afraid, I am not in agreement with this proposition. Whether it is this Government or the previous Government, when it comes to India's security concerns, this issue has been raised. The collective sense of this House, the other House, of the Indian Parliament, has always been one in this regard when it comes to rejection of terrorism sponsored from outside India. And, we cannot say that if we talk to the United States of America or if India talks of a comprehensive convention against terrorism, we are in any way betraying lack of confidence. This country has its own strength, this country has self-confidence in dealing with this menace. In fact, we are the major victims of terrorism. When we look at what has happened in the world in the last two decades, it is India which has been at the receiving end, but,

at the same time, we do share if there are similar incidents in other major regions of the world. That is why we are talking of a comprehensive convention through the United Nations, when all the member-States of the United Nations talk about. But talking to United States of America on this issue and other issue, I fail to understand, how it, again, means a departure. Sitaram Yechuryji had referred to that, and so, did the hon. Leader of the Opposition, about India's growing engagement with the United States of America; and , understandings which have been reached. Sir, we have discussed Indo-US relations on Saturday. The Prime Minister had made it clear, not only then but on previous occasions, that, yes, it is a growing bilateral engagement which is multi-dimensional. The United States of America is one of the important countries of this world. Nobody can deny that. Our policy has always been that independent Foreign Policy is only of independent decision-making, but we also have to take into cognisance the existing realities and meaningfully engage all the major powers of the world. When we say all the major powers, it does not mean exclusion of the United States of America. So, we have talked to the US, especially, about the energy cooperation, cooperation in space, cooperation in science and technology, etc. for which a bi-nation commission is being set up. These are important areas. India has been denied access to new technologies, cutting-edge technologies over three decades, and our nuclear establishment had worked, our scientists had worked in a regime of denial in isolation, and they have made this country very proud by accomplishing what they have.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Now, entering into newer agreements or arrangements does not mean surrendering those achievements, in any manner, or diluting for future, what our independent research and work has evolved. But if we gain access, access to fuel and technology, and India becomes a partner, like India has been invited now for the ITER project, for the Future GEN projects, what does that mean? The unlocking of the nuclear suppliers' group, which was discussed in detail the other day, does not impinge upon India's sovereign interests. India has not compromised when it comes to those areas where our strategic interests are involved, and I shall not expand on it because this was discussed in detail. But the decision, which facility remains civilian and which is strategic, that determination is India's, future determination will be of this country. If we are going to have an arrangement with the IAEA, it would be for one reason, Sir, because we never were party to the previous regimes. India is a non-signatory to the NPT, and I remember my friend, Sitaram Yechury's words, that when we are talking

of the Indo-US relations, then there has to be a convergence of interests in all fields, and also that realism means idealism and realism, and when it comes to realism, then it has to be 'engaging', but not 'succumbing'. I would like to assure him that there is no question of India's succumbing engaging 'yes'; engaging 'meaningfully'; engaging in a constructive manner' engaging in all fields; but not in any manner succumbing to any pressure. If there is any such impression or apprehension, we would like to dispel that. If you look at what was stated by the Prime Minister on three occasions in this House and even while replying to the discussion last Saturday, it should be abundantly clear that whatever has been agreed to has been after very careful negotiations which has the endorsement and the backing of a scientific community and the nuclear establishment. Sir, in this context, I may say, three specific matters were raised. One was about the UN democracy fund for which India has made a major contribution, significant contribution. But that is under the aegis of the United Nations. That should not be linked to other statements which have been made by the leaders of the United States of America with regard to their views on certain countries and the question of regime change which was raised. The Prime Minister and the Government had made it abundantly clear, 'we do not share that we do not subscribe to that; we do not endorse that.' So, that was settled once for all. There should not be any doubt on that count.

Again, Sir, one issue came whether there is any tilt. It was very clear from the speeches of both, the Leader of Opposition and Yechuryji, and other friends, where the tilt is. First of all, when the United States of America, which is a major power, willingly engages India, enters into certain arrangements or agreements in strategic fields, why should it be misread as a tilt? It is an acknowledgement—acknowledgement of India's achievements, acknowledgement, again, of India's prowess, India's credibility as a responsible, mature nation State, which has played a major role in the Comity of Nations. At the same time, it is recognition of the fact that India should not be kept away from major countries when it comes to the new generation of technology. So, that is how it should be viewed.

A question was put whether it should be a cause of celebration. We are not talking of celebrations when big nation states are involved. We say that we are also big and India's growing profile, India's growing strength, is being recognised now, whether it is by the United States of America, by France and other major countries. Well, for some it could be a cause for celebration, but Governments don't celebrate. Governments make a statement about what they have been able to achieve, what policies they

have been able to pursue. But surely, it cannot be a cause for national mourning also! These agreements or understandings, which we have reached, have been endorsed by major countries, by the United Kingdom, by France, by Germany and also by the IAEA. That needs to be understood and accepted by all of us.

We may have our different perceptions, but Sir, when it comes to foreign policy or national security concerns, we have always pursued, bipartisan policies. There are no partisan politics involved in the formulation of foreign policy. Sincere efforts have been made by the Governemnt, especially the Congress-led UPA Governement. It was the Congress Party, since the time of the Independence, which had formulated the nation's foreign policy, a policy that was independent and in India's interest. We tried to evolve a broad national consensus, through repeated discussions on all issues, whether it be the Iran issue, or the Indo-US relations. Now, again, it is indicative of the Government's commitment to inform, through the House, the country and also, to have a consensus, a broad consensus, as an endorsement of what we are doing, by sharing openly, in a transparent manner, what the Government is seeking to do.

One important issue that was raised was on multipolarity issues. It was said that bipolarity had collapsed with the collapse of Soviet Union, that it was a unipolar world, and whether we are accepting the concept of unipolarity. Sir, I would like to make it abundantly clear that we have never talked of unipolarity as an acceptable order. We have been engaging major powers of the world. If we have this new understanding in strategic areas with the United States of America, we are also mindful of the reciprocity, which is inbuilt, through steps which this country has to take, and the steps which the US has to take. But we have a strategic, close and very special relationship with Russia. We have strategic relationship with France and with the United Kingdom. We have entered into a strategic relationship and dialogue with the EU. We have an ongoing dialogue with the ASEAN. We have a new policy thrust when we are talking of the Look-East policy. Then, we have the IBSA initiative. Reference was made that it was Euro-centric and America-centric, and we are totally ignoring Africa and Latin America. That was a point raised by hon. Member, Shri Shahid Siddiqui. I am afraid that again, it is a misperception. That is not correct. We have an important initiative, that is, the IBSA initiative, which is a trilateral initiative between India, Brazil and South Africa. Now, nobody can say that Brazil and South Africa are countries which do not belong to the same thought process on multi-lateral issues to which India adheres too. Why I mentioned

all these is that these are indicative of our commitment to ensure a balance, to ensure that there is multipolarity reflected in our approaches. So, there is no question of any tilt. Why is it that only in this context this accusation comes? I would say, it is unfair. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is unfair because it is not only the political leadership which gives the guidance but our scientists, our diplomats, the official teams comprised of the officials are also engaged in these negotiations to finalise certain agreements or understandings, and, all of them have India's interests close to their hearts. When we make a sweeping indictment that interests have been forsaken or compromised, we are casting an aspersion on the commitment, on the sincerity of all of them. We can speak, the hon. Prime Minister can speak, the Members can speak here in the House but those who are involved in the negotiations, the officals, our senior civil servants who also serve the country with dedication and do lot of hard work, they cannot stand up and speak for themselves. Sir, I would request Shri Yechuryji and this House to please never have any doubts about them and to please be assured that when India negotiates, through its political leadership alongwith the establishment, they have the interest of India closest to their heart and that interest is never compromised. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: At no point of time, I meant this. Please don't misunderstand me. Do we question the integrity or the commitment of the people engaged in negotiations? Never. In fact, we hold them in high respect, and, we think, they are as much patriots as we are. It is not the questioning of integrity, it is the questioning of infallibility, and, infallibility is something that will be questioned and integrity is not to be questioned. And, that, I think, should be the yardstick by which we should go. Even the most committed patriots can commit mistakes, and, if they commit mistakes, that must be corrected. That is all what I want to say.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, while thanking him, I would like to say that I never said that there was any insinuation on the part of Shri Sitaram Yechury. What I was saying is that when some statements are made or when there are reports in the media, an impression is being created. Sir, what happens is that there is a running commentary that goes on and it's not only in this House. So, we have to be mindful of the political discussion and debate that is outside in the civil society. When you have informed or inadequately informed comments in the electronic media running 24 hours, or, if something appears in the print media, people tend to then believe them. What I have said is that if there is a consistent campaign or charge,

which is unfounded, it is important to have the clarification, and, that is why, you will appreciate that by repeatedly discussing every matter, this is how the fallibility is checked.

Once you are a democracy, once you are under constant scrutiny of the Parliament, you cannot trip. And, in a parliamentary form of Government, there is no question of a situation arising where major decisions, policy decisions are made with regard to our international relations or our national security concerns, would not have the discussion, the scrutiny of the Parliament, this House and the Lok Sabha. Also, eventually only that policy is pursued which has the broad national consensus.

Sir, I think that I have been able to respond to many of the things that have been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and my esteemed colleague Shri Sitaram Yechuryji. I would, one again, like to reiterate that there is no question of succumbing. Sir, as you were pointing out, with regard to our National common Minimum Programme engaging all countries. I would like to mention that this is exactly what we are doing. I pointed out about our engagements with Africa, with Latin America, which was your concern. This engagement and growing of relations and understanding between India and America are not at the expense of other countries, which we mentioned very clearly in the NCMP. So, that is not the case.

Lastly, Sir, one question has been raised by many hon. Members regarding the presence of Nepal's Maoists in India for talks. I refer to Nepal by saying that developments there are an area of concern, irrespective of the fact that there were internal dynamics. We have been engaged. We have been trying to reason to be persuasive. And, we believe that the democratic path is the only path. The political leaders from Nepal have been visiting India during the last few months. They have been doing it for decades in the past also. As Yechuryji would recall, we have been meeting with the political leaders coming from there as representatives of our respective political parties. And, Sir, the political leaders of Nepal have been holding periodic consultations also with the Maoist leadership, which is again their bilateral arrangement when the different political parties of Nepal, the Nepali Congress factions and Maoists have been talking to each other. There is no reason why they should not be. It is a good development if they are talking to each other and if they all are thinking in terms of eventually accepting some democratic process. We are not privy to what they are discussing. We have taken a broad policy position. But, we have not invited any leader. The hon. Leader of Opposition is not here. He has raised this point specifically. There are one or two other hon.

members who raised it. We have not invited any leader for any such consultations, as far as India is concerned.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, I would like to ask one question. If he yields.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, please. Later on.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Sir, on the question of Nepal. I would like to ask something from the hon. Minister. I agree that the Government of India may not have invited, but the fact that the Maoists Communist Party of Nepal has issued a statement saying that it is their goal to overthrow the Nepal Government by the force of arms. And, after the meeting that they had with their counterparts in India, a joint statement was issued, saying that the two Maoist groups would cooperate for the armed overthrow of the Government in Nepal and in India. In view of this kind of statement, that is emanating, how can the Government of India countenance any kind of dialogue that is going on, on Indian soil to facilitate settlement in Nepal?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: First of all, Sir, I was referring to the visits of the political leaders. Those political leaders have belonged to the democratic movements who had contested elections, who were in the successive Governments in Nepal. And, ever since the suspension of democracy, there have been various delegations which have come and those delegations comprise of respected, recognised, established, political leaders of Nepal. They have a viewpoint of their own. It is their independent decision to engage the Maoists. So, the talks will be between them, the contacts are between them. We are not facilitating, nor have we invited. I was clarifying that. Secondly, Chandan Mitraji, what you have raised is relevant. Such statements have been made; one is the 12-point programme which has been reached between the political parties and the Maoists. Now, it is again their own decision. And, if they want to forsake the path of violence, it is up to them. And, it would be a good development. It argues well, if all concerned parties accept the path of democracy and participate. It should always be encouraged. But, when we talk of violence, which you have referred to, we have been very clear whether such elements are operating within India, or, those who act outside, as per the principles laid down in our Constitution and law, as a constitutional democracy, India can never accept, India can never condone any statement which is of political violence and threat. And, within our country, where such forces are active, our establishment, our administration, our State Governments, our intelligence agencies and security agencies have been actively working. So, there is

no question of any compromise or any condonation, let me assure you. Sir, towards the end, I will only say that this discussion on the functioning of the Ministry has been an informed discussion and we take note of many observations. Many of them are very pertinent and relevant which have been made by our hon. colleagues and Members. And, Sir, to conclude, once again, I would assure that India pursues a policy which is India's policy. We take decisions on matters and on issues on merit. It is our independent judgement in conformity with our policy, in conformity with India's interest. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI TARLOCHAN SINGH (Haryana): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am here to praise the role of the Prime Minister who has brought so much honour and respect to our country by his achievements in the Foreign Policy. Up-till now, Dr. Manmohan Singh was known as "Economic Wizard', but now his name is at the same level in the diplomatic world. What he has done in the field of Foreign Affairs, even an ordinary Indian is all praise for him. But we cannot forget that the policy laid by Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee as Prime Minister was the base for what all India is now achieving. Nobody can forget that Shri Vajpayee took a historic step by taking a bus to Lahore which was unparalleled in the history of diplomatic relations. All his actions at that time opening India's arms to the whole world were hailed everywhere. Today, we want that India should go on succeeding in this field. Sir, I want to raise certain important issues concerning the Ministry of External Affairs, so that in this debate they should also be noted for certain improvements.

Sir, my first point is that all our Embassies abroad should be friendly Embassies not only to foreigners but also to Indians settled abroad. Lot of complaints come regarding how people are being treated, and how much time they are to stay when they go there. So, there should improvement in the working of our Embassies.

Secondly, Sir, since India's policy is good, lot of tourists are coming, and the staff meant for issuing visa, they say, is less. The Ministry of External Affairs should strengthen its visa staff, so that people get visa at an early date.

Sir, lot of Indians without passport and without legal papers are staying in many countries. They are seeking somehow the citizenship of those countries. Recently, Spain and Italy invited applications from the people to give them citizenship. But they could not apply, because the Embassy was to give them some identification slip. And that identification slip required

4.00 P.M.

that people should establish their identity within their own states. But I am sorry to say that our Embassies totally failed to help those Indians there in Europe whereas Pakistan took advantage of that and thousands and thousands of people have been given citizenship in those countries, and there our Embassies totally shunned those people and did not give them any advice. I request, Sir, that the MEA should issue some circular that if all Indians the try to get citizenship, our people should help them. There should be some column in their Annual Report showing how many people with their help have been able to get citizenship in those countries. That will be of great help.

Sir, I want to raise a serious issue. There are a lot of Indians who are issued visas from abroad. But when they come at our airports, they are sent back because our computers here do not find their names. I have a list with me. It shows that 86 people having valid visas, issued by our Embassies abroad, were sent back from our airports. Now you can imagine the fate of those people. They spent money when they were sent back and suffered harassment. Last year, 79 people were sent back. What was their fault? When they come with valid visas, the Ministry should have some accommodation there, so that, at least, they stay there in the night and next day you check with your Ministry whether the valid visa is there or not. Till today, nothing has been done as a remedial measure to help those people. Sir, lot of Indians abroad are applying for the renewal of passports. But they are never given a new passport. There are hundreds and hundreds of applications of Indians who seek renewal of passport. But they are still coming to the embassies and not getting their renewal. Sir, I am sorry to report again here that the Ministry of External Affairs is maintaining a 'black' list. It is a very shabby word. This is a list of those belonging to Sikh community who in 1984 shouted slogans outside the embassies and they noted their names and they are not being given visas till today. From 1984 to 2006, still that list is maintained. People want to come for pilgrimage to Amristar. People want come to their family, but the visa is denied because they were part of the demostration. Sir, Punjab is fully part of India. Punjab is progressing. The Government of Punjab every day is inviting the NRIs. Our Chief Minister went abroad and told them. But why the Ministry is not removing the list? I propose that if you have some fear of them, at least, allow them a seven-day visa so that they can come and go back and when they go back, they will be happy with the conditions

prevailing locally. I just quote one case. Deedar Singh Bains was known as a Khalistani. He was president of the Khalistan Movement. he was allowed visa four years back and today, he is the biggest supporter of the country because when he visited Punjab, he went so happily. I moved a case of one Jaswant Singh Thekedar living in London. His son was getting married in Ludhiana. I requested Kunwar Natwar Singh Ji. He also wrote a letter but the visa was not issued even before two days. So there are certain cases where we should help them. Sir, I want to propose here that Wagah border is one of the most popular border of India. But the conditions there are so bad for two reasons. One, because you have not approached Pakistan Government to open a visa office in Amritsar. The Canada Government has a visa office in Chandigarh. The UK Government has a visa office in Jalandhar. Then, why should not Pakistan also be approached? Now, we have friendship. Maximum number of people go from this border. Why can't we have a visa office there? Secondly, because the trade movement has started, now, when people go there the traders have to wait for two days. The trucks cannot go. Government should now try to open the Firozepur border as second border, and that can become trade border. (*Time-bell)* Both borders can be opened simultaneously because this problem is there. In addition to this, a train comes every day from Lahore to Attari. And a bus goes from Delhi to Lahore and Lahore to Delhi. But people of Punjab are deprived of that. Why? Anybody coming in that train to Attari, he is not allowed to enter Punjab. He must come to Delhi and if he wants to go to Punjab, he can go from Delhi. Now, Punjab is not more a disturbed area State and even in the case of Maleir Kotla, which is the home of Muslims, those Muslims who want to go to Maleir Kotla they can't go from Amritsar. They have to go to Delhi. So, why this anomaly is still existing? Anybody who lands in Attari, he should be free to go by train to Amritsar, by bus to Delhi or anywhere because he has a vaild visa to come here. But this problem is still there. Even if there are seats available in the bus, you cannot board anybody from Amritsar. The bus is only from Delhi to Lahore. In between you can't do it. We are thankful to the Government for allowing a new bus to Nankana Sahib. But restrictions are so tight that I don't think it will be successful. You want a 15-day earlier check. Then, to get a visa to come to Delhi takes one month. Then, how will people go to pilgrimage? There should be some new methods for the pilgrims who are going by this bus. Give them a permit. You are giving permit from Kashmir to other Kashmir and with the permit people are going. If the bus is only for fifty pilgrims from Amritsar to Nankana Sahib, give them a permit so that they can go from Amritsar and come back by the that bus.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI TARLOCHAN SINGH: Sir, just two minutes more. Sir , lakhs and lakhs of people are settled in Middle-East. We are very happy with our relations with Middle-East. But those countries are not allowing Indians to perform their religious duties. Those countries are still raising objections for our religious shrines. Expect Iran perhaps no other country is allowing them. Even there is a restriction on the cremation of dead bodies of the Indians in certain countries, and the people are required to bring the dead bodies to India. So, if we are so friendly with them, and when we say that all religions are equal, why are these restrictions still being imposed in the Middle East? The Ministry should try to help them. There has been a pending case of France. They do not allow Sikh boys to wear turbans. But, one more new condition has been imposed. If a Sikh goes to get a driving licence, he has to do bare-headed. Unless you are bare-headed, you cannot get your photograph on the licence. Now, this type of restriction these days is a very shameful act, and the Government of India should see to this aspect of the matter, Sir, during the regime of Taliban in Afghanistan, all the Hindu Sikh shrines were destroyed. I will request the Government that now that you have got so good Government in Afghanistan, and Pakistan is also very allergic to that, the Ministry of External Affairs should help in restoration of those shrines. Those shrines were historical, and connected with the vist of Guru Nanak Dev into Afghanistan. So, that help should be given.

In the end, while praising the effort of the Government of India, I would like to make one submission. The NRIs, who have given so much help in this success, they should also be looked after properly. I only want one minute. The President Bush had a meeting with our religious representatives. Eight people were invited by him, and it was on their own effort, and I must praise that all the eight people, all belonging to different communities jointly told him that India is a country, where there is a tradition that we love each other, we respect each other, and for the first time, these religious people could change the perception of the American Government that here, there is no issue of minority and majority. So, the Government of India should take advantage of such meeting with other foreign Heads of State because, a lot of propaganda goes abroad that the minorities are being executed. But, how we live in India, we should send this message also, through such talks. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI E. AHAMMED): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I do not not want to take much of the valuable time of this House because the hon. Prime Minister

will have to give reply to many of the points that the hon. Members have raised here. I just would like to confine myself to some of the specific issues that the hon. Members have raised here, and I think, the Government is duty-bound to refer to what they have mentioned. Some of the hon. members, like Shri Shahid Siddiqui, Prof. P.J. Kurian and others have raised some of the problems....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, is the Minister replying? I have given my name.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not replying. It is just an intervention.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Two interventions!

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There may be more interventions.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Joshi, you are always in a hurry.

SHRI E. AHAMMED: The U.P.A. Government will be following the policy, especially, towards the West Asia, on the basis of the Policy Statement made in the Common Minimum Programme, and the UPA Government has confirmed the policy towards West Asia that the Government will have a new thrust in its relationships with the West Asian countries. In pursuance of this policy, the Government has been trying and striving very hard to strengthen the bilateral relationship with the countries in the West Asia, and the land mark visit of the King of Saudi Arabia, His Majesty, Abdullah Bin Abdul Aziz, is worth mentioning in this context. His visit took place after 51 years, and during his visit also, there were several Memoranda of Understanding signed between the two countries. That will again further strengthen our relationship, and also our position among the Islamic world. this year also, for example, with the Saudi Arabia's help, we could sent, 1,47,000 Hajis. They were permitted to go for their Haj pilgrim. This was the second largest contingent after Indonesia during the Haj, and the Government of India, in consultation with, and in cooperation with the Central Haj Committee, and the Saudi Government authorities, have made elaborate arrangements for the Haj pilgrimage. There may be some shortcomings here and there, and the Government will take steps to rectify them, and make the Haj hassle-free as far as possible, and comfortable also.

Unfortunately, this year, there was a stampede as a result of which 62 Indians lost their lives. Out of these 62 Indians, 46 were sent through the Central Haj Committee, ten were sent through the registered private

tourist operators and six were living in Saudi Arabia. They might came from the neighbouring countries. Next of kin of these 46 Hajis, sent through the Central Haj Committee, will be given compensation, under the Haj committee's Group Action Compensation Scheme, to the tune of rupees One lakh to three lakhs. But, unfortunately, the families of the other ten people, sent through the private operators, and the other six people, living there, have not been given compensation. When the matter was brought to our notice, the Prime Minster took steps to consider the matter. Now, it is under the consideration of the Government to provide compensation to these 62 Hajis families on humanitarian grounds. The Prime Minister and the Government will issue orders, after taking a decision about the quantum of compensation, in this respect.

Sir, I would like to mention here also what Hon'ble member Shri Shahid Siddiqui mentioned about India's relationship with Palestine. He also mentioned that India formed an alliance with Israel, and also with the United States. I do not know from where he has got this information. So far as the Government is concerned, there is nothing like that, and India is countinuing its traditional unwavering policy of supporting the Palestine cause and helping the Palestine people to have their homeland, and also to live in peace with neighbouring people. For the hon. Member's information, Sir India has extended all humanitarian help to the people of Palestine. And I myself had carried medicines worth two crores of rupees and 15 vehicles as soon as this Government resumed office. I think, it was on 17th September, 2004, when Yasser Arafat was alive, that Yasser Arafat himself told the internatonal media: "I express my grateful thanks to the Prime Minister, the people of India and the political parties in India for having sent their representatives on a goodwill visit and all that. "That was the nature of relationship between India and Pakistan. Therefore, I do not know why there is any doubt about our continuing relationship with Palestine. Of course, India has a diplomatic relationship with Israel. With Israel also, India is having exchange of business, trade, everything, but it has nothing to do with our relationship with Palestine. India will take care of it that there is not negative impact on the traditional relationship between India and Palestine only because India is having some relationship with Israel.

Sir, I would like to mention one thing more, and our Special Envoy of the Prime Minister has already undertaken a trip to Palestine and Israel, especially to establish a contact with Hamas who have been elected and who are the choice of the people of Palestine. So, after his visit also, he will take some more steps, if necessary, in this matter. Sir, the MEA is

taking steps to tackle some of the issues raised by my esteemed colleague, Prof. Kurien, about the Indian Embassy there. It is true, Sir, that there are four million Indians living only in the Gulf countries, out of which 1.5 millio Indians are in Saudi Arabia. It is in this context, Sir, I have mentioned about the visit of the King of Saudi Arabia, and we have been taking steps to find the Malayalam-knowing officers as far as possible. Only their availability is the most important thing. Of course, we are very much conscious of some of the problems of our Indian nationals living in these areas. This Government has taken some very, very practical and helpful steps for tackling the problems of the people living in these areas.

In Saudi Arabia, we have established on-line arrangement and any Indian in Saudi Arabia can contact our Embassy in Riyadh at any time-24 hours, 7 days. That is going on very well. Apart from that we have asked all the Embassies in the region to have an open-house meeting with the Indian community even without prior intimation. That is also going very well.

Sir, my friend, Mr. Tarlochan Singh, has referred to some difficulties in other European Embassies also. If there are any such things, of course, the Government will only be happy to consider them and see whether they can also be sorted out by arranging such open house meeting with the Indian community.

Sir, I would just like to mention here another important thing. Prof. Kurian has mentioned about providing voting rights to the NRIs. That is, of course, under the consideration of the Parliament.

Sir, another thing which I would like to mention is Indo-Arab relationship. It is growing from strength to strength. As an indication of it, it was for the first time that India had been invited to attend the Arab Summit, as an observer, last year, in 2005, when it was held in Algeria. I would like to inform the House that this year also India has been invited to attend the Second Arab Summit to be held in Khartoum.

Sir, I don't want to take the time of the House since other Members want to participate in the discussion. I would like to mention only one more thing. Mr. Tarlochan Singh has raised some issues here. These problems happen mainly because of the objections raised by the Home Ministry. The Ministry of External Affairs will have to consult the Home Ministry. Only after doing that, we will be able to take the necessary steps in such matters. I have noted all the points that he has raised. I will take

them into account and discuss with him the problems that he has mentioned and wherever possible we will take steps.

Sir, I would like to emphasise one thing. The Ministry or the Government will not take any action against anybody on the basis of his religion. There is absolutely so such thing. No complaint has been received from anybody that an applicant who has applied for a passport or renewal of a passport has been harassed only because of his religion.

This Government will not allow any such thing. The Government will take action against any officer who indulges in such things. Thank you.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I should also thank Sardar Tarlochan Singh for having made a speech which is relevant to the discussion today, the Discussion is on the Working of the Ministry of External Affairs, while everybody else talked about the Foreign Policty matters. That is how the Leader of the Opposition kick-started the debate and everybody followed suit, including the two Ministers of State. The Foreign Policy discussion was concentrated largely on the United States and Pakistan, which is understandable. Before independence, the Foreign policy really meant only the United Kingdom. Now, after independence, the foreign Policy covers relationship with the United States and Pakistan.

Sir, I am very modestly going to talk about our relationship with two neighbours only, Nepal and Myanmar or Burma. I think, the difference in the treatment that we have given to these two countries brings out a lot of contradictions between what Shri Sitaram Yechury called realism and pulpit evangelism. The Report does a good thing by bringing out very clearly that in Nepal the break up of the democracy was not on the initivative of the King. It is only because the seven parties, the so-called democratic alliance, had a 12-point agreement with the maoists that the King though it necessary, in order to defeat and uproot the Maoists, to have his own rule established in Nepal. After that, we have cut off most of the relations. We have not supplied arms. With the result, the only Kingdom in the neighbourhood, which has certain cultural and denominational affinities with us, is now finding the arms in Pakistan and China.

Compare the treatment we have given to Nepal with what we are doing to Myanmar. More than 30 years ago, the Army Junta took over in Burma and incarcerated Aung Sang Su Kyi the daughter of Aung San, who is now a Noble Laureate and a recognised leader the world over as wearing the

mantle of Mahtama Gandhi. If there is one person in the world today who represents the great spirit of Indian philosophy that Nehru promoted, one must recognise, it is Aung Sang Su Kyi. Now what happens? We have had successive visits of various external Affairs Ministers to Burma. They shook hands with the military Generals and military Ministers. Recently, Sir, even the President of India went to Burma and not only did he meet all the Generals but actually signed three agreements. One agreement, I can understand because India has some interest in petroleum. But granting them technology in remote sensing is something that is certainly a matter of strategic importance and that could certainly help consolidate the position of the army dictatorship there. Sir, the President of India could certainly have met Aung Sang Su Kyi by going to the jail. If the military rulers did not permit it, he should have refused to go to Burma. Even Bush comes here and sees Advaniji and sees other leaders of the Opposition. He met some of the groups of the Sikh community also. There was absolutely no reason why we should have overlooked Aung Sang Su Kyi. The difference in the treatment of two countries comes from the fact that possibly, let me use the term, Nepal is a Hindu Kingdom and India has a Hindu majority. I have absolutely nothing to be ashamed of that because it is a Hindu majority country we have a Muslim as President, a Sikh as Prime Minister and we have the Chief of the Ruling Party, who is a Catholic Christian.

This can happen only in a Hindu majority country. It cannot happen anywhere else. So the plurality of India comes essentially from the fact that it is a Hindu majority country and nobody can be more secular than that. Do we have anything against the Monarchy in Nepal? The Head of the Commonwealth is a Mōnarch and in India, if throning by discent is an indication of monarchy, then we ourselves are, a little, tending to be a monarchy. What it is that made us to take a very bellicose attitude towards Nepal? What it is that makes us to show such a benign and loving attitude towards Myanmar? I think there is a great departure from the great, lofty ideals that Nehru propounded in his days. I had an occasion to congratulate the Prime Minister when I had the good fortune of meeting him for the historic performance in signing the agreement with the United States. I have absolutely no doubt about it. I can say one thing. While the United States might have committed any number of sins in Iraq or anywhere else, or in Guantanamo Bay, It is an open society. Presidents may go wrong there, but their system is such that those Presidents are brought down. Bush may have gone wrong, but in the United States itself, as Hon.

Siddiquiji pointed out, they are trying to bring him down. There are processes which will permit the American people to bring down those who go wrong. So, I congratulated the Prime Minister for the historic shake hands with the United States. But, I think, nearby in our relationship, in the neighbourhood, what we are doing to Nepal is wrong and what we are doing in Burma is also wrong and that is something for which I would like to have an explanation. Thank you.

- SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am glad that I have got this occasion to speak because, at least, I shall be heard, for a few mintues, when the Prime Minister is here But I wanted to stress one major thing that comes out from the discussion. The point of foreign policy is not just what we are conveying to the foreigners, it is also what we are conveying to our people. It is very important that our people support the changes in foreign policy, if they are taking place, or if the changes of the stance of foreign policy that is taking place today. Whatever you might say, I think this historic agreement with the United States has changed our foreign policy stance. We are now in a differenct mould of foreign policy. This has given our Prime Minister an opportunity to chart new ways of looking at international relations. In a sense, after Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy, this is probably the first time a new Prime Minister has come to give a new orientation to our foreign policy. It will evolve. I am not saying that foreign policy is a static thing. It will evolve. But it is necessary for the Prime Minister to take the country along with him. We must also realise that this is one issue on which we find Shri Jaswant Singh, the Leader of Opposition, and Shri Sitaram Yechury, are on almost the same wavelength. There is no point in saying that what Shri Jaswant Singh was saying earlier was different. Today, both of them are taking the same position. Shri Jaswant Singh was categorical that people would think that we are now in the yard of the United States. Shri Sitaram Yechury is saying that in the name of the so-called enlightened national interest', we are moving away from our esteemed principles of idealism, which he thinks is the aim of foreign policy. But that was, maybe, the rhetoric. The idea is that-- it may be a misapprehension; but there is an apprehension in the minds of our people in the country. And I beg to submit to the hon. Prime Minister and the other members of this Government that they must recognise this uneasiness among the people of our country. President Bush is not a very popular figure in the world. He is not a popular figure even in the United States. He is not a popular figure in the developing countries, among the Islamic

countries, for the many things that have happened to those countries during his regime. Thar does not mean that when he comes here, we shall not be polite. We have to be polite and we have to treat him with the courtesy that he deserves. But we must realise what is going on in the minds of our people. The mind of the people comes back to the same question; are we moving to the yard of the United States; are we giving up our foreign policy stance, on which there is a national consensus, which has been built for ages, after Pandi Jawaharala Nehru. This question has to be answered categorically. The Prime Minister has actually answered them. He has mentioned this in several ways. But I think it is important to be categorical about reiterating those principles.

What are those principles; and let me just point them out. I hope somebody will be able to relay to the Prime Minister. It is important to reiterate that our foreign policy is based on non-alignment, not in the sense of the earlier Cold War days; non-alignment in the sense that our foreign policy not decided by alignment to any particular country or any particular power. This is based on the much more significant issue-in fact, that has been mentioned in the foreign policy book of MEA- of Panchseel, the Five Principles, and these five principles categorically state that we reconginse the sovereignty of all the countries. This reiteration itself would deny any misunderstanding about our siding with any regime-change. This is not a part of our foreign policy. Whatever may be the view-point of the other country, or the US President, this is not the Indian position. This is, of course, what the Prime Minister has said. but I think it should be categorically reiterated, not so much for Prsident Bush or for Americans—I will come to that in a minute—but for our population. There are millions and millions of Muslims in our country. I will not be surprised if they are worried to hear from our soil this question of Iran being a counry ruled by a group of Islamic clerics; who do not know what democracy is and therefore, there is a question of regime-change.

We do not have to contradict President Bush. But, we must realise that millions of our Muslim population, not only the Muslim population, even the secular population must be worried to see that such a statement has been made. Therefore, I would consider it important that we reiterate that this is not a part of our Foreign Policy. Our friendship with Iraq, Iran or Palestine remains as they are. I am very happy to hear that on Palestine, our Special Envoy—just now the Minister of State said—is having a discussion with the Hamas. This is a very remarkable position. This should be categorically stated because the Hamas is taken in the United States

as the principal terrorist element which is against Israel. In fact, the Israelis have refused to negotiate with the Palestine, even when the Hamas has been elected with an overwhelming majority. I am so happy to hear that our people, our Special Envoy is discussing with Hamas. And this is exactly what we should do. The Russians are doing similar things. And, this particular news should be broadcast, should be known to all our people, all our Muslim population, all our Islamic friends that we are not changing our position. It is very important to reiterate the fact that our Prime MInister categorically stated that we are not supporting or we shall nevger support what happened in Iraq. I was also happy to know that the question of the pipeline with Iran has also been opened up. I think these stories should be advertised to tell our people that there is no change in our basic Foreign Policy. We are not against Cuba; we are not against Venezuela; we are friends of all these countries in the world because we believe in a Foreign Policy based on relationship with all the countries, particularly the other developing countries.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, these points should be reiterated together with another point, which Mr. Sitaram Yechury talked about the question of multi-polarity. It is true that we do not believe in a bi-polar world. But, that is not enough. It is time that we should declare that we are one of the poles in that multi-polar world. And, this particular new agreement will give us a chance to become effectively one of the poles in the multi-polar world. This particular point needs reiteration because in the United States, whatever may be the other things that are going on, there is, definitely, a feeling that India can be a friend of the United States in this multi-polar world, in a way, that would help the American bipolarism. We sould completely disillusion them, that we shall play a role of a polar power in that multi-polar world, in a way, a non-aligned country, an independent country can play. As a matter of fact, if we do that, this would help the United States also because we can play the role of an intermediary power. And, this particular new role we should play quite categorically. Why I am saying all this, Prime Minister has entered the Chamber, I feel that we have to talk to our people here that this Foreign Policy is a Foreign Policy which has been built up through decades of national consensus, and we are not giving them up. No doubt, we should highlight the achievements of the Nuclear Agreement. There is absolutely no doubt that this particular Nuclear Agreement has been a major progress in the whole international policy. But, please do not mix it up with other areas of CEO meeting, technological groupings etc. These are quite all right. We can discuss

that; we can debate that. But, the pure Nuclear Agreement is something that will take us out from a different kind of an international order to a new international order. Ms. Condoleezza Rice has written an article on this subject. Everybody should read todays's morning paper. The question was raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh as to what is their interest, American interest in that. He should read that particular article, where Condoleezza Rice categorically points out what is the American interest in supporting India on this. So, I have absolutely no doubt of the American position. But I do feel that having listened to all the discussion here, there is a possibility of our people being misled--I am using the word very deliberately 'being misled'--by different type of propaganda that we are moving away from a policy that we have followed for so many years. And that is what I think, our leadership should categorically state that this is not the game that we are playing. Thank you very much, Sir.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND ALSO IN-CHARGE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion on this very important subject. We have, of late, several opportunities in Parliament to discuss specific issues on our Foreign Policy. And I welcome this opportunity for a more wide ranging discussion on the subject in the context of the working of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Sir, Shri Sitaram Yechury asked about the objectives that we are pursuing through our foreign policy. I had on an earlier occasion stated that our foreign policy is rooted in our civilisation heritage and also for the pursuit of our enlightened national interest. Right from the times of Jawaharlal Nehru, India has pursued an independent foreign policy shaped by these two twin pillars that I have mentioned. As Panditji himself used to say, "We live in a dynamic world and that with the changing needs of time, our attitudes, our policies, our strategies, our programmes, must evolve. We cannot be a blind prisoner of the past."

I respectfully submit to this august House that this precisely is the emphasis of the Foreign Policy changes that have been made since our Government came to power. Earlier also I said that the fundamental objective of overall policy of our country must be to grapple with the problems of poverty, ignorance and disease which afflict millions and millions of people in our country. We can take pride in our achievements in tackling these problems since Independence. But who can deny that we have still a long mileage to go? And that, of course, requires basic changes in the way we

think, the way we act, the way we shape our domestic policies, but it is also necessary that our Foreign Policy should also promote the realisation of these basic objectives. That means that we must create an external environment which is conducive to the removal of poverty in the shortest possible time. To do that, we need an international environment which is supportive of India's economic objectives. As I said on an earlier occasion also, our economy now is growing at a rate of seven to eight per cent. We need to step it up to about ten per cent per annum. That is feasible with marginal efforts; with marginal improvements in international environment and that it is the duty of every Government which takes the problems of development seriously, to pursue a path which would facilitate the realisation of these objectives. We are today investing about 31 per cent of our GDP. Our domestic savings rate is about 29 per cent. With another two or three per cent of GDP coming from abroad by way of foreign capital, we can step up our growth rate by at least one to two per cent per annum. We need the import of modern technologies to upgrade our technologies in various activities, agricultural activities, and industrial activities. And if we are trying to create space for larger imports of capital, larger imports of technology, if we are trying to create space, which is conducive to rapid growth of our exports, where do we look at? We have essentially to look at the possibilities that exist from countries, which are exporters of capital, we have to look essentially to countries which can export relevant technology to us, we have to look at countries which are willing to absorb our exports. And that is why our emphasis on improving our relations with countries like the United States, countries of the European Union, countries like Japan, countries like Russia countries like China. In doning so, we are promoting our enlightened interest. It is not a surrender of autonomy in decision-making processes. It is not kowtowing to the United States for the fun of it. As I said on an ealier occasion, whether we like it or not, the United States is the preeminent market economy in the world. It is an important source for the export of capital, for the export of technology, and, therefore, it is in our national interest to engage with the United States to see wherever space exists so that we can take advantage of engagement with the United States to promote our national interest. The United States, of course, is a superpower. It thinks globally, it acts globally and its interests do not have to be coincided all the time with us, and where we do not agree with them, we state our position clearly, unambiguously. When I went to Washington in July, I was asked at the National Press Club about our attitude to Iraq and I unambiguously stated, "In my view the invasion of Iraq was a great mistake" We have never been shying

away from stating our positions even though it cannot be to the liking of Big Powers. But that does not mean that wherever opportunities exist, wherever opportunities arise to engage with countries like the United States, the European Union, Russia, China that we should not utilise those opportunities. If those opportunities give us options, widen our options for our development, for our growth; it is our duty as the Government of this vast country to take full advantage of those opportunities. That is precisely what we have done. As Jaswant Singhji pointed out, the Nuclear Agreement with the United States is rooted in our conviction that economic security of India cannot become a firm reality unless we have energy security and that energy security in turn can be facilitated if we have greater access to nuclear technologies. If the restrictions that the Nuclear Supplier Group and the United States have imposed on trading with us in nuclear material, nuclear technologies, if these are done away with, that will give us greater elbowroom in ensuring energy security for our country. This matter has been discussed earlier in the House and, therefore, I do not wish to deal with it at any great length. But, I do wish to emphasise, once again, that in engaging with the U.S. We are not surrendering our autonomy in decision-making processes. We are not becoming an ally of any country. We are not part of any alliance system. But, the fact that the U.S. is a democracy, we are a democracy; the fact that both our countries respect the rule of law, respect fundamental human freedoms, I think, this does bring about a certain amount of convergence and this cannot be helped. If we emphasise that, I don't think there is any disadvantage. The fact that we are a democracy, the fact that we would like others also to be democracies, does not mean that we are interfering in the affairs of other countries. The fact that we are contributing to the UN democracy fund to build capacities in countries which are trying to emerge as democracies is not something which is wrong. We have invested about 600 million dollars in the last four or five years in revitalisation of the economy of Afghanistan so that Afghanistan emerges from its medieval past into a functioning democracy. I recognise with Jaswant Singhji that the establishment of a democracy in a country is not a mechanical overnight operation. In dealing with human emotions, human feelings, human sentiments, all these cannot be predicted in any unambiguous manner. Even then, I think, if we help nascent democracies like Afghanistan to stand on their own feet, there is nothing wrong with that. We are a contributor to the democracy fund but that does not mean that we are going to be partners of any attempt to change regimes. We are not part of any such attempt to change regimes. As I said, democracy is a value system, which we cherish. We would like other countries also to be functioning democracy

but I don't think we can impose our views or thoughts even if we wanted to. We can not bring instantaneous results overnight. Certainly, we are not part and parcel of any attempt to change regimes.

In matters relating to foreign policy, while there has been substantive improvement in our relations with the United States -- the President's visit is one indication of that -- that does not mean that we have surrendered our autonomy in decision-making processes. During the last two years that this Government has been in office, our relations with Russia have improved a great deal; our relations with China have improved a great deal. Last year, when Premier Wen came here in April, we signed a landmark agreement, which lays down political parameters and guiding principles for the solution of the border issue. Our Special Representatives have been meeting since then. They had a meeting two days ago and I hope that out of these meetings will emerge some solution to the difficult problem of the borders. In the meanwhile, our economic relations with China are improving year-by-year. china has now emerged as a major trading partner of India. We look at France. When our Government came to office there was a certain element of coldness in the relations between India and France. That coldness is a thing of the past. The President of France was here and even before the United States agreed to this nuclear deal, the French President was the first one to say that India needs a new deal from the nuclear community in the world. We have excellent relations with the European Union. In September, 2004, we entered into a strategic partnership with the European Union at The Hague. Last year, the Prime Minister of the UK came here as President of the European Union and we agreed upon a concrete action programme to give meaning and content to the strategic partnership.

We look Eastwards. Our relations with the ASEAN countries have improved considerably. We are now a part of the East-Asian community.

On the West-Asia side, we have the privilege of welcoming His Majesty the King of Saudi Arabia only a few weeks ago as the Chief Guest of our Republic Day. The Emir of Qatar has been here. The queen of Jorden has been here the First Lady of Qatar has been here. Our interactions with the West-Asian countries have improved and have increased very substantially in the last two years. Therefore, I respectfully submit to this august House that they should judge us from the totality of the results achieved by us and not concentrate merely on the changes that have come about in our relations with the USA. I don't apologise for any of

these changes that have come about. They, I think, create new space for us. They give us greater elbowroom to accelerate the pace fo social and economic development. They are to be welcomed. But, any notion that any deal that we have done with the USA amounts to surrender of our independent thinking, I respectfully submit, is totally misplaced.

Sir, I now deal with our relations with the neighbouring countries. Our relations with our neighbours are, naturally, a source of great interest to hon. Members in particular and to our nation in general. Our Government has given priority to engaging pro-actively with our neighbours. We participated actively in the Thirteenth SAARC Submit in Dhaka last November. Therein, we announced several measures, including transit facilities, on a reciprocal basis for the faster economic development of our region.

As I have publicly stated many times, we are committed to a resolution of all outstanding issues with Pakistan, including the issue of J & K through dialogue and consultations. I have emphasized to President Musharraf that Pakistan must adhere to and fully implement the commitments given by him on January 6, 2004. We have made it clear that the cessation of terror and the dismantling of the infrastructure of terror on territory controlled by Pakistan are essential for the process of succeed. Both sides are committed to the success of the comprehensive dialogue process which has been moving forward steadily. The gains in terms of building confidence and trust, between our people, estranged for decades, are now visible. The continued provocation by terrorists will not weaken our resolve to build normal relationship with this important neighbour or our resolve to decisively deal with those who wage war against innocents and attack the secular facbric of our State.

I have already mentioned our relations with China. They are also developing very satisfactorily. My colleague Prof. Kurian welcomed these developments. And, I am sure, there is wide consensus in this regard. On the long-standing issue of our boundary question during Premier Wen's visit last year, we reached a landmark agreement on the guiding principles and political parameters for a framework to delineate the boundary. Our Special Representatives have met recently, and the process is moving forward steadily. We hope to welcome President Hu Jintao to India later this year. At the same time, our trade and economic ties are expanding rapidly. China is now one of our largest trading partners. We believe the consolidation of this vital relationship will have great significance of the regional architecture of peace and stability in the region, in Asia, and in the world as a whole.

5.00 P.M.

Sir, several colleagues raised issues regarding our relations with other countries in our neighbourhood. I should state that our Government is moving forward in our relationship with our neighbours on the basis of a vision of a prosperous, interconnected South Asia at peace with itself, and engaged with the world. For too long, we have wasted the undeniable potential of our people through short-sightedness. The example provided by our relations with Sri Lanka shows that there is no reason why despite dissimilarities of size, both parties cannot benefit from closer cooperative relations. Our relations with Bhutan have also similarly benefited both countries. We seek to develop the closest cooperative ties, addressing each others' vital concerns with all nations of our region. Our President visited Myanmar recently. We have consistently supported the process of dialogue national reconciliation and political reform in that country. I should make it quite clear that we would like democratic forces to have their full play in Myanmar. whenever we have had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the authorities in Myanmar, we had made known our views without any fear or without mixing mataphors. But that does not mean that we should not engage with Myanmar. Myanmar is our neighbour. Several insurgent groups, operating in our North-East, use Myanmar's territory. therefore, it becomes necessary for us to have a relationship with that country, which might help to control the activities of these insurgent groups in our neighbourhood. That's the logic why we have been engaged with Myanmar authorities. That's why our hon. President was in Myanmar recently. But that does not mean that we support the repressive measures that may have been taken by the authorities in Myanmar. We have great sympathy for Sui Kyi. I sincerely hope that Sui Kyi will soon be free out of prison.

Sir, the Prime Minister of Bangladesh will be visiting India later this month during which period we will discuss all the bilateral issues in a candid manner as befitting close neighbours.

We also hope to welcome President Karzai of Afghanistan to India in the near future. As we have said before, we support the establishment of a sovereign, stable, democratic and prosperous Afghanistan. And, we will do what we can to help in this process.

Sir, mention was made about the situation in Nepal by Shri Jaswant Singh and Dr. Chandan Mitra, among others. They spoke of reports that meetings had been organized with Maoist leaders in the vicinity of Delhi. I

would like to state that there is no question of Government of India organising such meetings on our territory. However, our Government is mindful of the need to ensure that the impact on India from the disturbed situations within Nepal is minimised. Events in Nepal do affect us widely. There is no passport system between our two countries. If there is trouble in Nepal, it invariably means larger inflow of people into our country. So, like Bangladesh, what happens in Bangladesh and Nepal becomes, whether we like it or not, our concern. Therefore, normalcy, peace and prosperity of our nieghbours is in our vital interest.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I do not wish to go into great detail, but across the boad, I would like to assert that we are developing closer ties with both new and traditional partners. I have mentioned about our ties with the European Union. We have built valuable and effective strategic partnership with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom with regular interactions at the highest level. I have mentioned about the visit of President Chirac last month which gave a new impetus to the very valuable relationship we share with France.

In the Asian region, we are adding depths and new dimensions to our cooperative ties with Japan and Korea. We have excellent relations with the countries of South East Asia bilaterally and in the ASEAN framework. I participated in the first East Asian Summit in Malaysia a few months ago. Our relations with the nations of West Asia are developing consistently as I have said a moment ago, including through the landmark visit of His Majesty, the King of Saudi Arabia.

Contacts with other nations in the West Asian regions are also dynamic and extensive. In this regard, Shri Chandan Mitra expressed concern that the relationship with Israel has been systematically down-graded. This is not correct. We are not reviving our age-old ties with the nations of West Asia at the cost of our relations with Israel. Our principled position on the Palestinian issue is unchanged. We remain supportive of the efforts of the international community in finding a just and durable solution to the problems faced by the Palestinian people, so that they may achieve a State of their own. At the same time, we attach importance to our friendly relations with Israel which we hope to strengthen and diversify.

Sir, similarly, we have maintained mutually beneficial links with traditional partners in Africa and Latin America. Shri Shahid Siddiqui spoke of the need for the Government to focus on these relationships as well. I am happy to reaffirm that we will build on our histroical links with these

nations to create modern, 21st Century-oriented relationship based on mutual complementarities. The India-Brazil-South Africa initiative is one such partnership which will allow us to leverage each others areas of strength for our collective benefit.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, specific mention was also made by several Members of the agreement on civil nuclear energy cooperation with the USA, and I have dealt with this thing extensively. Therefore, I do not wish to repeat what I have already stated.

Sir, in closing let me repeat what I stated about our faith in the abiding priniciples of our foreign policy laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal and followed consistently by our country. At the same time, we are alive to the impact of changes that have been brought to our external environment by the rapidly changing international order. We remain committed to intensify our engagement with the world community bilaterally, regionally and multilaterally, including through the U.N. and other international organisations to utilise every emerging opportunity for the benefit of our people.

In conclusion, Sir, I would like to mention that Shri Sitaram Yechury pointed out that nowhere in my speech or in the Report of the Ministry of External Affairs, was a reference made to our commitment to universal nuclear disarmament. I believe, I had covered this subject in my previous intervention in this very House and I would like to repeat that India happens to be the only nuclear-weapon State which believes in universal nuclear disarmament. There is no weakening of our resolve. That is the ultimate objective to which we remain committed. With these words, Sir, I once again, thank all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. Thank you.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Prof. M. M. Agarwal; absent, Shri Santosh Bagrodia; absent, Shri Shantaram Laxman Naik.

The Delimitation (Amendment) Bill, 2006.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delimitation Act, 2002.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 2006.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa) : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951.